No. 10450

United States
Circuit Court of Appeals
For the Ninth Circuit.

HARRY BRIDGES,

Appellant;

vs.

I. F. WIXON, as District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice,

Appellee.

Transcript of Record

VOLUME XIV

Pages 6251 to 6720

Upon Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division

Rotary Colorprint, 590 Folsom St., San Francisco

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT NO. 283

Flash!! Flash!! Last minute report of Arbitration Board findings bottom Page I

Published by A Rank & File Group in the I. L. A.

WATERFRONT WORKER

October 18 1933 Vol. I, No. 12

Waterfront Worker

Price: One Cent Page 1

"IMPARTIAL" BOARD SITS ON DISCRIMINATION

Union-Buster Sloss on Arbitration Board

From the very first beginnings of the ILA on the San Francisco waterfront, the ship owners showed that they were determined to keep the BB. Many men were knocked off at various docks and at dif ferent times for refusing to pay the BB dues or for belonging to the ILA. Inspite of the demand of the majority of the longshoremen to answer the shipowners with strike action to force the BB off the waterfront Holman & his side kickers refused to act and tried their best to prevent the rank and file from taking the initiative to act.

The Matson Co. has always taken the lead in the fight against the stevedores and it was there that a showdown had to come and did come in spite of all the efforts of Holman and his machine to hold the men back and thus give in to the shipowners attempts to save the BB. The strike on

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

the Matson was more than a strike against the discrimination of 4 members of the ILA. It was a strike for the recognition of the unions. And for this reason it not only concerned the stevedores on the Matson but every stevedore on the front. The strike threw a strong light on many things. It showed that the shipowners are determined to fight it out and that the stevedores were just as determined. It showed, however, that little in the way of leadership can be expected from the top officials of the union or from the International.

The rank and file will have to develope leadership from its' own ranks. None of the strike tactics that are used by workers everywhere were used. No organized mass picket line existed at any time during the strike. Much in this respect can be learned from the miners, who bring their families and all sympathetic workers into the picket line & organize picket lines in front of scab-herding agencies. No efforts were made to make the strike known to all the unemployed or the seamen on the Matson ships, or to call on them for support. No efforts were made to involve the teamsters.

The failure to take these steps, which are necessary to win any strike, was mainly due to the lack of a broad strike committee and to the fact that the Matson stevedores allowed themselves to be bulldozed into folding their arms by means of the old Red Scare. The shipowners will always drag

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

that out unless we act just as Scabby Peterson wants us to.

With the Matson ships tied up & support coming from San Pedro, the Northwest ports, and Australia, it was a mistake to submit to arbitration. The issue was clear. Either the Matson took back the four ILA members, or it didn't. What the striking Matson stevedores will get by arbitration is well illustrated by the fact that on the board of arbitration sits that well known union-buster, Judge Sloss, who as a member of the Industrial Association was successful in the breaking up of the building trades union in San Francisco.

In this case we can accpet no compromise. Either the shipowners recognize the union of our own choosing or they don't. We cannot allow ourselves to be blinded by so called "impartial" arbitrators. We Must Stand Ready for the Next Move!!!

Smash the Blue Book!!!

Flash!!! As we go to print report comes that our Mass Solidarity forced—the Arbitration Board to decide the four men fired will go back to work!

October 18 1933 Waterfront Worker Page 2

ACTIVITIES OF "WATERFRONT-WORKER" IN THE STRIKE

While the leadership of the ILA, the Holmans down to those that want to get in (the Kulbergs)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

were busy making statements to the papers, that they could no longer hold the men in check, the Waterfront Worker did its' duty—3000 special Don't Scab editions were issued.

The group of longshoremen responsible for the Waterfront Worker was the only organized body who took any concrete steps whatsoever to fight the recruiting of scabs. The leaflet was issued on Tuesday night and Wednesday morning immediately following the walkout, calling upon the other stevedores, the seamen, the teamsters and all workers not to scab. This leaflet was given wide distribution, in the Fink Hall, along the skid road, at the Murray & Ready employment office, among the teamsters, all along the Oakland Waterfront, in North Beach, Mission district, and every other place where a possibility of attempts at precruiting scabs might take place. This leaflet was very effective in accomplishing its purpose, proof of this is the fact that the shipowners found it impossible to hire scabs among any of the workers whom the leaflets reached.

One reason for the success of this leaflet was the fact that it had been proceeded by another leaflet, which was distributed along the S F front just prior to the strike. This leaflet also called upon all workers to support the Matson stevedores in their demands. With the excetion of two men, who are dealt with elsewhere in this issue, these two leaflets

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

received the heartiest endorsement of all workers who read them.

The Waterfront Worker takes this opportunity to point out to the rest of the ILA members, that if they do not immediately take control of their organization, by means of rank & file dock committees on every dock, they will suffer disasterous results from the misleadership from the officialdom of the ILA.

EXPEL THE TREASURY THIEVES

Those responsible for the treasury shortage will try to use the excitement of the moment created by the Matson strike to escape punishment. Because a struggle with the shipowners for better

Continued on Page 5

N R A & COMPANY UNIONS

Dealing with workers through company unions is in full conformity with the NRA, said Robert L Lund, Pres. of National Ass'n of Manufasturers, in a statement addressed to William Green, Pres. of the AFof L.

Lund's statement dealt with Green's sham attack on company unions.

Lund complained that Green and other AFofL officials could not control the rank and file members, saying, "It is clear that a great deal of the organizing effort and agitation resulting from it is the work of men, some of them of very radical be-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

liefs, who pay little attention to those leaders nominally representing them."

The National Association of Manufacturers says that 80 per cent of its members support NRA.

VOTE FOR WHOM?

The Waterfront Worker in looking over the 30 candidates and their platform for the coming elections, recommends to all longshoremen to vote for the six Working Class Candidates.

Some candidates want votes because they were born somewhere in S F or other, some because they belong to some order or other, others promise economy, but at who's expense they don't say.

We can all agree with the platform of the six Working Class Candidates . . . Cash Relief—Abolition of the Vagrancy Laws—No Evictions—Gas, water and electricity for the unemployed—Unemployed Relief at the expense of the rich tax payer.

Vote for Jack Bishop, John Diaz, Ed Harris, Louise Todd, & James Tracy for Supervisors. Neil Hickey for Treasurer.

THE OLD RED HERRING

It is an old trick of the bosses that whenever the workers strike to better their conditions, they are accused of being Reds. According to Scabby Peterson and one or two misguided workers, any worker who don't agree with them is a Red. But what do we see? It was old Scabby himself who sent in

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

scabs to the Matson Co and not the so-called Reds. The best way to answer that is by sticking together and fighting our common enemy, the shipowners, instead of fighting among ourselves.

* * * *

October 18th, 1933 Waterfront Worker Page 3

We will need the pages of the Waterfront Worker more than ever. Things will be happening—are happening—differences of opinion—meetings—Use the Waterfront Worker to express yourself. Address—3470 19th Street.

The Mail Bag

FRANK WORDS FROM THE RANK AND FILE

Editor:

How about Joes gang of scalers of Pier 44 moving freight from one side of the dock to the other, getting 35 cents per hour while hundreds of longshoremen are idle. Why don't the ILA correct this? We stevedores demand action, not promises as has been the case in the past.

A Stevedore.

STRAW HAT BEN. HE'S NOT SO HOT

About a year ago the Admiral Line canned Straw Hat Ben Knutson, but he was reinstated when he promised the Company that he could save them money—and how.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

He had the gang bosses tend hatch, thus doing away with one man. However, about 6 weeks ago the candykid with the gum nose was demoted to hatch-tender himself, kid-gloves and all! Since then he has lost even that job, and has been relegated to the extra list.

We may mention heer that besides wearing kid gloves and dressing . . . like he thinks the well dressed gigalo does he also wears a wig to keep his brains warm so he caon hatch out more bright money-saving ideas for the Admiral Line.

A Stevedore.

OVERHEARD ON THE FRONT

Said one worker to another: "Say, John, I am a newcomer on the front, looking for work, and they call me a "prospector". Now I thought prospectors always had a jack-ass with them."

John: "Yes, but don't sit around and wait for the $1900 the Blue Book tells us we make, or you will be the jack-ass, and starve to death." Demand cash relief for all unemployed and part time workers!

QUESTIONS TO MEMBERS OF THE ILA

Should cops belong in ILA? If not, what is McNulty, who is a probation officer, doing in the ILA? The same people who sent the cops to protect the scabs on the Matson docks, most likely sent McNulty in to stool on the members of the ILA and

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

also behind the scenes to run the ILA through Holmen. McNulty hasn't worked on the beach for years so he has no business in our union now. Not until we get rid of McNulty and his kind will we have a fighting union which will protect our interests.

FROM ONE WHO WANTS TO KNOW

When Holman recently got up on the soap box and chirped about being ready to die for the stevedores he must have been very sure of his ground, considering that a hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars have gone to the doctor to make damn sure that Lee doesn't lose his life.

With us stevedores facing a battle, these dollars might be one of the things that will spell the difference between defeat and victory. Demand an accounting of all funds!!!

From a Stevedore.

Dear Editor:

The thousands of Charity workers who refused to scab during the Matson strike should receive the support of every stevedore on the front in their fight for Cash Relief.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)
Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

October 18 1933 Waterfront Worker Page 4

UNDER BELOW—By the Hatchtender—

BIG LOAD
THOMPSON
SOME MORE ON BIG LOAD

Last month on the Admiral dock, B L Thomsen got a bright idea. He had the car gangs load the cargo on board slings during the day, then sent the dock gang home, using the only jitney drivers and hookers on dock—the hold gang workers—thus he saved overtime on half the gang.

* * * *

Dear Editor:

The lot of the prospector is hard on the front. We must shape up early on the Embarcadero and if we don't make it which is usually the case, we go to various docks where ships are due. Some of us play some docks—others play other docks, but the story is always the same. It means long hours of waiting for the ship to dock, and then more waiting in the hope the Boss will pick us. And if we do get on it may last only an hour or so.

Now comes the question—how do we live? Well some of us live in the Rich street soup line on the skid road. Some of us who are married, work for the Charities and get in return, food that in most cases, could not be sold on the public markets, and for this rotten chuck we must work every third week.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

Fellow stevedores and Waterfront workers: Demand cash instead of groceries. Demand cash at the expense of the very shipowners who are trying to force their rotten BB union on us.

A Stevedores.

YOU CAN'T JOIN THE ILA

On the Nelsen pier 22, Dog-faced Nelsen is so in love with B.B. he has squaked to the men not to wear I.L.A. Buttons.

Get wise, Dog Face. Remember the Matson strike.

* * * * *

EVERETT WALK-OUT SUCCESSFUL

A brief but successful walk-out occurred on the Everett waterfront, Oct. 5th. Resentment against a hiring system of favoritism and discrimination, under which straw-bosses would pick the men that they pleased. One hundred and forty men walked out of the Fink hall in a body.

Everett is one of the ports that has a duly elected grievance committee. This grievance committee informed the employers and in an hour's time Mr Weber, head of the Fink hall arrived from Seattle to arbitrate matters. A meeting was called of over 100 men and Mr. Weber pleaded with them to give the companys a break . . . not to hold them responsible for the action of their straw bosses.

After Wever left the hall the men took a vote

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

. . . agreed to go back to work only if they be allowed to pick their own men to do the hiring and the other straw bosses be fired. These demands were granted and the men then went back to work.

RECOGNITION THRU ARBITRATION?

The argument that the Matson Co agreement to arbitrate amounts to recognition of the ILA is but a stretch of the imagination. What are the facts? In the first place the Matson Co is not arbitrating directly with the ILA but thru an "impartial" board. In the second place after arbitration the Matson can still tell the longshoremen where to get off. The coal operators did that to the 100,000 miners and now they are striking for recognition a second time. The only time the shipowners will recognize the ILA without a fight is when the ILA becomes as harmless as the BB. What will be the gain then?

* * * *

October 18 1933 Waterfront Worker Page 5

FIGHT FOR UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

In Jersey City, a man, unidentified, except for a button proving membership in a longshoremen's union, was found dead of starvation. In his pocket, he had one 5-cent piece, kept apparently for an emergency. The emergency came, and mercifully took him away.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

Whatever is done will be done too late for him in this world.

TAKE A TIP MICKEY

While you were out fighting the Waterfront Worker, Mickey Rowen, scabs were being hauled into the docks. What did you, as a Union stevedore do?

The Waterfront issued a special bulletin calling on workers not to scab, which was given to seamen, longshoremen, teamsters, unemployed workers, and others, and you by your actions, tried hard to stop the only leaflets issued in support of the strike. The stevedores know, in spite of the write-up you received in the papers, that whether intentional or not, you actually gave support to the shipowners by your actions. Continued similar actions may win for you the reputation of being a rat, and we certainly do not want this to happen, Mickey.

GRACE LINE CUTS WAGES

We together with other seamen on the Grace Line were made happy recently when we saw the Blue Eagle flying above. But our happiness didn't last long. They fired 19 Chinese stewards and replaced them at the rate of one white worker for every three Chinese fired.

Their next step was to cut wages 8%. When the Santa Barbara found this out a ships committee was organized with the result they didn't get the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

cut. The Grace Line has announced that under no circumstances must seamen who belong to the Marine Workers Industrial Union be hired.

A Seamen.

Continued from Page 2 Col 2

Fellow stevedores; it is time that we forget what political beliefs the next worker has, when we are fighting for the betterment of our conditions; but rather we must unite in one common fight against rotten conditions existing on the beach. We must not be scared by the word Red. The bosses & their agents always try to keep the workers divided by calling the workers Reds because they strike and fight for better conditions.

NEWS FROM OTHER PORTS
ILA OFFICIALS MAKE AGREEMENT TO LOSE STRIKE

New Orleans, La. Dock men working on the government owned Federal Barge Lines went on strike on Sept 11 tying this line up. These men demanded 50c an hour straight time, & 75c an hour for overtime. Six men to a hold, four men to a car, two men to a bag. The Eight Hour day.

They got in touch with the ILA representatives, Darcy and Spencer who worked out an agreement to get the men back to work under the same conditions they were striking against. Being a government line, they got the recent Roosevelt 15% economy cut, reducing their pay to 34c an hour. The

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

men work as long as necessary. Five men were cut off each gang.

During the strike there was no picketing, and scabs freely came to work. The strikers were warned by the ILA to beware of the Reds, or the government wouldn't negotiate with them.

This action was in distinct difference from the St. Louis strike of last August, where the bargemen led by the Marine Worker's Industrial Union organized a strong picket line, and won all their demands.

"Stockholm, Sweden—Following similar action taken in Danish ports, the longshoremen of Stockholm refused to unload the German freighter "Malkah", until it would pull down the Nazi flag it was flying.

JUST SOMETHING TO REMEMBER

The American Hawaiian line reports profits of 105,818 dollars clear. A Senate investigation of ship-subsidies now in progress discovered 66,000 dollars paid for carrying an entire pound of mail. During the past fourteen years the government has paid to shipowners a total of 3 & a half billion dollars. According to reports of the 22 Annual Safety Congress recently held in Chicago, the Marine Industry is only exceeded in severity rates by foundry, quarry, construction, lumbering and mining industries. Therefore the Congress decided to still

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

keep this industry on the list of hazardous occupations.

Continued from Page 2 Col 1

conditions is on, it is doubly important for us that they do not escape. Now it is more important than ever that honest men lead the ILA. The trial of Holmen & others must take place immediately & when found guilty, expelled.

* * * * *

October 18 1933 Waterfront Worker Page 6

STEVEDORES! SEAMEN! STICK TOGETHER!

In the last regular issue of the Waterfront Worker we carried an article dealing with the unity of white and Negro stevedores in which we pointed out the shipowners policy of playing one worker against another as a means of breaking a strike and warned all workers to be on guard against any attempt of the shipowners to divide our ranks and lower the living standard of all workers on the Front.

That our warning was well founded is proven by the following facts:

On Thursday, Oct 12, in North Beach, a meeting was called by one "Fat", a colored tool of the ship owners. About 80 Negroes, mostly unemployed, were present. After listening to a white representative of the shipowners Ass'n make a long

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

winded flowery speech in which he said, "If you will stand by us now we will stand by you later".

Later in the evening, at a resort on Post Street, between Webster & Fillmore, beer and sandwitches were set up at the expense of the shipowners.

Last Saturday night in a cellar at North Beach (No. 6, Stark St.) "Fat" again addressed a group of colored workers—this time only about 23 were present. This time he told them, "When you go to work, work as hard as you can. Build up a reputation, and maybe we can get a 5 year contract, when the strike is over".

After "Fat's" pretty speech, one Negroe got up and spoke in spite of threats of violence, pointing out that they would only hurtthemselves and that their own people would turn against them if they scabbed. Finally the entire gathering got up and walked out at the request of the speaker to show their solidarity with the strikers. They walked out leaving "Fat" and his secretary alone and bewildered in their foul basement.

WAR GOOD OR BAD

With war preparations going strong, with shipments of war materials constantly increasing, some workers think war is OKay. Look at the last war . . . we all had a chance to work . . . made good wages. Let us reason this out. First, is there a new world war to be declared and why? The statement that wars are fought to gain markets, wealth,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

and to increase the power of a nation, is proven correct by the capitalists statement in "trade follows the flag". Lack of trade then becomes one of the conditions which creates wars. A check of figures show the U. S. is losing 60%.

Much of this trade however was lost due to the fact that there has been a tremendous drop in purchasing power throughout the world.

The fight for the remaining markets becomes more sharp. Therefore all nations who must sell goods to make profits are spending untold billions to prepare to take the biggest slice of the world trade. The U. S. alone spent, out of a public fund, 938 millions of dollars for the army and navy this year. And other stunts are pulled. Wages are constantly cut so competing nations will be in a better condition to undersell on the world markets. Proof of this is shown by every $10 in wages we workers got in in 1926—today we only get $4.26. In addition to this prices are being boosted to 1926 levels.

We can readily see that even war preparation means more misery for us. At present, in addition to fighting among themselves, these capitalist nations are seeking to attack the Workers Republic, the Soviet Union, the only country in the world where wages go up, hours come down and there is no unemployment. War itself will mean 6% guaranteed profits for the bosses as provided by an act of Congress, and the army scale of pay for the workers.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 283—(Continued)

Smash the Bosses War Plans.

Demand That All War Funds Be Used For Unemployed Relief.

Refuse To Ship War Supplies.

NORWEGIAN MUNITION SHIP EXPLODES

Colombo, Ceylon—Through several rescued sailors picked up at sea it is learned that the Norwegian munition ship, "Himnoy" carrying a cargo to Hong Kong exploded 300 miles out from Colombo. The ship sank immediately with almost the entire crew.

[Endorsed]: Filed June 2, 1942.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have before me now the Western Worker, San Francisco, September 18, 1933, in an article here appearing in the third column of the front page: "Communist Slate for Election in S. F. Nominated, Conference of workers organizations to endorse slate planned, Only workers ticket, A. F. of L. officials back Rossi Machine; . . .". You didn't back the Rossi Machine, did you? A. No.

Q. You were an A. F. of L. official at that time, weren't you? A. That's right.

Q. "Locals to be canvassed for Red ticket".

A. Yes.

Q. Was your local canvassed for the Red ticket?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't recall. Possibly it was.

Q. Would you say that it wasn't canvassed?

A. I couldn't remember that. It is entirely possible it was. I just don't remember.

Q. To read on: "San Francisco, Sept. 11.—The Communist Party has nominated candidates for the five supervisors and city treasurer, to be elected in San Francisco this November. They are: For Supervisors: Jack Bishop, Longshoreman; Louise Todd, office worker; James Tracy, railroad worker; Edward Harris, Machinist; John Diaz, Agricultural Worker. For Treasurer, [5901] Neil Hickey, Miner".

Those are the same names, the same persons that appear in your Western Worker here for October 18, 1933, on page 2, are they not?

A. Right, and were supported by the Waterfront Worker. They were running for office, and legally, I understand, we supported them through the paper.

Q. Now, this is the issue of the Waterfront Worker, Western organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., isn't it, the one I have just shown you?

A. "Issue of the Western Worker", you mean?

Q. "Western Worker".

A. Yes, right.

Q. And is it true that the Communist slate for election in San Francisco nominated the persons I mentioned—Jack Bishop, Louise Todd, James Tracy, Edward Harris, John Diaz and Neil Hickey?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Is it true that they say it in there?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

Q. The Western Worker wouldn't print falsehoods?

A. They possibly have made a mistake or two in their time.

Q. Would they make a mistake?

A. I would believe the Western Worker before I would believe the Hearst papers, for example. [5902]

Q. Do you believe that that is a correct statement, that the Communist slate——.

Mr. Gladstein (Interposing): I think this question calls for conjecture and it wouldn't satisfy the requirements of proof.

Suppose the witness says that he doesn't have——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Well, he has said it so many times.

Mr. Gladstein: Suppose he says that he hasn't any doubt, that it may be so? That still doesn't satisfy the rule requiring proof of the fact. I don't think it is a good substitute to take care of that problem before offering the document in evidence, and we will renew the same objection.

Presiding Inspector: I suppose that Mr. Del Guercio is pressing him for an admission in that respect.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have a right to do that.

Presiding Inspector: Of course you have the right to press him.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer the copy of the Western Worker in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Mr. Gladstein: We make the same objection.

Presiding Inspector: For what purpose do you offer it?

Mr. Del Guercio: For similarity of names.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, that is admitted.

Mr. Del Guercio: May I offer it for identification then? [5903]

Presiding Inspector: Yes. You may have it marked for identification.

(The paper referred to was marked Government's Exhibit No. 284 for identification.)

Presiding Inspector: He admitted not only the similarity of names but the similarity of the identify of persons. There is no question about it, I suppose?

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Is there any question in your mind that thos persons were the candidates of the Communist Party, Jack Bishop, Louise Todd, James Tracy, Ed Harris, John Diaz, and Neil Hickey?

A. I couldn't say with certainty, but I am sure that the city records would show whether they were not. They could be running on the Communist Party ticket without necessarily being Communists.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, just a moment, please. The San Francisco municipal elections and

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the county elections are non-partisan elections. It would be impossible for any candidate now or at that time to run on a Communist Party platform or any other.

Presiding Inspector: I can't accept that.

Mr. Del Guercio: That isn't an objection, if your Honor please.

Mr. Grossman: Just a moment! Therefore, any reference [5904] which indicates that they were running on any party ticket would be misleading the witness, because it would have been impossible at that time.

Presiding Inspector: The witness has assumed that that was so, I think. Perhaps I misunderstood him.

Mr. Gladstein: It might well be that all that actually happened would be that if——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): If your Honor please, I object because it is on a matter that I want to press the witness on here, and also unless there is an objection——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Still, I must hear the objection.

Mr. Gladstein: We are objecting to the offer in evidence of the document, because no proper foundation has been laid for its introduction.

Presiding Inspector: It hasn't just been offered, has it? It was offered some time ago.

Mr. Del Guercio: A ruling has been made on that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I haven't received it except for identification only.

Mr. Del Guercio: For identification only.

Presiding Inspector: It has been marked for identification.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will ask the question again. I don't know whether [5905] it has been answered or not. Is there any question in your mind that Jack Bishop, Louise Todd, James Tracy, Edward Harris, John Diaz and Neil Hickey was the Communist slate for election in San Francisco at that time?

A. Supported by the Communist Party?

Q. Yes.

A. No. I think that is correct. But I am basing my answer on what I read in the paper there. I don't necessarily disbelieve the paper on that ticket matter.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

[5906]

Presiding Inspector: All right, Mr. Del Guercio.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, during the time that you and your group of longshoremen were putting out this Waterfront Worker were you collaborating with the Western Worker in any manner? A. No.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. In anywise, in connection with the matters that were to appear in the Waterfront Worker?

A. No. It depends on what you mean by "collaborating," of course.

Q. Were anybody on the Western Worker giving you any ideas to be used in the Waterfront Worker? A. Not that I recall; no.

Q. Would you say that they didn't, that nobody——

A. (Interposing): I would say they didn't.

Q. Did Harry Jackson give you any ideas?

A. Oh, at the start; yes. We asked him how he put out the paper; and it seemed to be simple, and we figured we could do it. After we got rolling we thought we were very self-sufficient.

Q. And you told Harry Jackson, "We don't need you any more;" is that it?

A. I don't think we exactly done that, but we didn't need anybody. We felt we were getting along fine.

Q. Did Harry Jackson continue to give you ideas? [5907] A. No.

Q. Did you at any time, in the Waterfront Worker, tell the readers to read the Workers' Press? A. Oh, that is possible.

Q. What is the Workers' Press—what was the Workers' Press at that time?

A. I don't know; I don't recall what we had reference to. It might have meant a lot of things.

Q. Was it the Western Worker?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Possibly—the Western Worker and other publications.

Q. Communist Party Publications?

A. Not necessarily. We might have meant the Labor Council Journal, or might have meant the Leader—might have meant a lot of papers.

Q. Who drew the cartoons for the Waterfront Worker?

A. Oh, we had somebody quite an artist; I forget his name.

Q. Was it one of the group of the longshoremen putting out the paper?

A. Here is what it was: They were traced generally. In other words, you could pick out a cartoon from a newspaper, or a magazine, or something, and you could trace it, trace the general outline.

Q. Who did the tracing, who in your group?

[5908]

A. Wherever the paper happened to be stenciled, mimeographed, at that time.

Q. Who did it?

A. I am not sure; I can check up and find out. To the best of my recollection, from time to time the mimeograph machine was moved around, was located in this person's home, and in that person's home. I can check up on it definitely.

Q. You don't know who did the tracing, or who drew the cartoons that appeared in the Waterfront Worker, is that it? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Who was it?

A. I can't recall the particular person's name.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was there more than one person?

A. I would know him, would have seen him. You must understand we knew a lot of fellows by their first name or a nickname.

Q. Was it a longshoreman connected with this group? A. Yes.

Q. Was it any of the ones you named?

A. I think he was among them; yes.

Q. One of those that you named?

A. Yes, sir. As I say, at times one of the fellow's wives done the tracing. I recall that.

Q. I show you the March 22, 1934 issue of the Waterfront Worker, and call your attention to an article in it, a [5909] cartoon appearing on page 2.

A. (Examining cartoon.)

Q. Now, will you look at that cartoon?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Who drew that cartoon?

A. Just a minute. I want to look at the story. It might help.

(Examining article): Well, I couldn't say who drew the cartoon, this specific one.

Q. The cartoon represents two workers?

A. Apparently that is what it is meant to represent.

Q. Does it represent longshoremen?

A. No—well, I guess they could represent any workers that pack a lunch box.

Q. What are they reading?

A. The Western Worker, according to the cartoon.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And immediately underneath that appears "Read the Workers' Press," does it not?

A. Yes. I think the entire article and the cartoon indicates that the Waterfront Worker was advocating the workers to read the Western Worker.

Q. Who advocated them to read the Western Worker?

A. The people that put out the Waterfront Worker, including myself.

Q. And you advocated at that time the reading of the [5910] Western Worker? A. Yes.

Q. And you knew at the time that the Western Worker was the official organ of the Communist Party of the USA?

A. I believe that is correct.

Q. No doubt about it, is there?

A. No. I think that——

Presiding Inspector: He testified to that several times before.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this copy of the issue of the Waterfront Worker in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: Does it add anything to the testimony?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. It shows—it is documentary evidence of the Alien's cooperation with the——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): We have no objection.

Mr. Del Guercio (Continuing): ——Western Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. At times the Western Worker——

Mr. Del Guercio: Is there a question pending?

The Witness: No. I am sorry.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 285.)

GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT No. 285

WATERFRONT WORKER

Vol. 2, No. 7 March 22nd, 1934

San Francisco, Calif.

THE STRIKE and Its LEADERSHIP

The Waterfront Worker advises the men to go forward with the strike preparations regardless of the advice of the couple of weakkneed brothers who did their damnedest to disrupt the Special Strike meeting.

Brother Finnegan ran true to the form he displayed at the ILA Convention, when he came out for arbitration, and recognition thru Regional Labor Boards, which plan was discarded by the Convention, in favor of a Coast-wise strike to win recognition and our demands.

The Waterfront Worker wants to point out if we follow Brother Finnegan's advise of relying on Pres. Roosevelt's intervention, & allowing the shipowners another 20 days to prepare for the strike we will find ourselves in the same position as

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

the auto workers, the Railroad workers, and the Wierton Steel workers. These workers were betrayed and promises broken on their return to work after they were assured of a square deal by the N. R. A.

The impression created by Brother Finnegin, that the District Executive Board has the power to call a strike or to end it—is wrong. The Executive Board has only the authority to negotiate and to recommend. The power to call off the strike must be left in the hands of the Central Strike Committee, who are the true representatives of the men. This is the only way we can be sure that the wishes of the membership can be carried out and the danger of sell-outs avoided.

We have had one experience with Labor Advisers, and now we have a lawyer who wants to dic-

(Con. on Page 6, Col. 2)

(Cartoon—Shipowner: I Can Only Speak for San Francisco. Scabby Peterson: A Closed Shop Is Unfair. I. L. A.: We Demand a Closed Shop, $1.00 an Hour, $1.50 Overtime, I. L. A. Recognition, and No Rats. We Are Preparing to Win! Stein: The Blue Book Is a Good Union Come Back.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)
Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)
Page 2 March 22, 1934

Water Front Worker

BIG LOAD DEMANDS TONNAGE

It happened during a dark and stormy night not so long ago, one of the Admiral Line ships was working at full speed, the ship was late, cargo must be discharged in a hurry, in order to send the ship on her way and to the next port.

The Gaffer was none other than Ben Ohm, a character well known on the Frisco front. He was doing his best, urging and egging the men on to hurry their work. There was plenty of hollering & growling and sarcasm. The stevedores were sweating blood, for the going was tough, but all thought that they were doing their very best.

Then like a bolt of lightning from a blue sky the unexpected happened. Big Load Thompson appeared on the scene. According to very authentic information received by us B. L. T. was about "three sheets in the wind" he'd been splicing the main brace. And then something happened to Ben Ohm. Mr. B. L. T. proceeded to bawl him out, and told Ben that the 5 gangs working the ship were only averaging 87 tons per hour, only 87 tons per hour, just think of it. The steamship owners must grow many gray hairs worrying over this.

Was Ben's face red when the great B. L. T. dressed him down, his knees actually shook and the roar was gone from his voice. Benny only

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

draws $200.00 per. Big Load Thompson gets $500.00 per month for thinking up schemes to cheat the longshoremen out of work. Money which should go into the pockets of the men as wages, go into B. L. T.'s jeans instead. He must be keeping a harem on $500.00 per month, while many a poor stevedore can't even take his wife or gal to a nickelodean. Well let's hope things are different after the strike, maybe there two characters can be eliminated.

(Cartoon—Worker: Hook It Onto the Bulkhead. B. L. T.: You Moved Only 57 Tons the Last Hour. Ben Ohm: Be Careful, Big Load, the Boys Won't Be Rushed.)

WESTERN WORKER

READ THE WORKERS PRESS

Many workers in the marine industry are beginning to realize for the first time that newspapers do not print the workers' side of the story. Many workers are beginning to see the vast amount of resources the shipowners have at their disposal to try and confuse the men and get them back into the Blue Book. It is easily understood that the shipowners who can pay thousands of dollars for advertisements—are going to get the preference in stories sent to the press. Is there any worker foolish enough to believe that the newspapers are seeking the truth or will print the longshoremens' side of all the misery, the long wait for jobs in

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

the shape up, the tramping up and down the waterfront in prospecting the beach, the speed-up, the bosses shouting and raving for more tonnage, when we longshoremen, thru our organization, the ILA, have no money to spend for quarter page advertisements.

We workers if we want the truth we must try and read the Workers Press. The Workers Press prints the workers stories. The hunger and misery we face when we go on strike, our toiling at Break Neck speed to build up profits for the Bosses. The Workers Press prints these tales truthfully, simply and boldly.

We must not only read our own press, but we must write for it too. The Workers Press has no reporters to send out in taxicabs with cameras and pads, the workers on the job, on the picket line, on the CWA jobs, in the soup line and flop houses, on the farms and in the shops are the reporters.

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO THE WORKING CLASS PRESS

During a strike you will need the Waterfront Worker more than ever.

Keep the Waterfront Worker informed of all news on the front.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)
Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)
March 22, 1934 Page 3

Waterfront Worker

ON THE SPOT

BLIND BOSS THREATENS GANG

Charlie Kallini, one of the bosses for the associated Terminals, warned his gang that if any of them walked out when the strike is called, the strikers will lose their jobs.

Charlie, you are blind to facts—you have as much chance of scaring the men from strikings as you have in keeping the tide from coming in. Get next t yourself, the shipowners only use you when you are useful to them, you can no longer serve them, you are junked. Stick—to your class—the working class. To hell with the shipowners and The parasites who rob us of what we produce. Stick together. Strike with the men.

Editor Water Front Worker:

Just a few words to let you know that our Secretary, Mr. Keys, has skipped with a chunk of I.L.A. Dough. He was also, Secretary of Ferry-Boats union. He was recommened by Mr. Kulberg.

I. L. A. SAFE CRACKED

We wonder why the shipowners sent their stool pigeons over to Try and crack the I. L. A. safe? May be scabby and Plant thinks they can — uncover a "red-plot" or find secret orders direct from Moscow.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

(Cartoon — Shipowner: Open Her Up. There's Orders From Moscow in It. Two Cracksmen: She's Sure a Tough Crib!)

"WHAT A MAN??

The other day, the young efficiency expert, Big Load Thompson came on the Admiral dock, packing quite a load of this 98 cents a pint liquor. Drunk or sober he is an efficient boss always. So he staggered up the gang plank and bawled Ben Ohm the gang boss, out for not getting out the tonnage. Good stuff Big Load, you had better take full advantage of your opportunity because the I. L. A. will soon clip your wings—drunken bosses will not be allowed on the docks after the I. L. A. gets recognition.

Ed's Note: We have another report of the same incident.

SAILOR BLACKLISTED
NEED OF UNITY

On Washington's birthday, the crew walked off the Griffau because the skipper would not pay overtime. The Crew walked off after they found that the longshoremen were getting holiday pay and the sailors were not. Later one of the sailors on the Solano but after the skipper found out that he had been in the crew of the Griffau the sailor was fired. Brother stevedores this is just one of the many reasons that we must strike to enforce

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

betterWorking conditions on the front. For 14 years the shipowners have been doing such tricks as this and they have been getting away with it. Now the time has come when we must put a stop to it. Longshoremen, steam schooner men, sailors, teamsters, & all waterfront workers stick together and win. Do not let the disrupters split us up by telling usThe seamen's troubles are not the concern of the longshoremen and vice-versa. We longshoremen can help the seamen win better working conditions and the seamen can help the longshoremen win I. L. A. recognition.

We must stick together. Let us go down the line arm and arm United. For better working conditions. For union recognition.

As we go to press we are notified from Stockton that the Gentleman, who was strongly recommended by our International Organizer. Mr. Kulberg left town in a hurry with ILA funds that the men had to scrape up to pay dues. Kulberg fixed it up so the men can't work any more.

THREE REGULAR JOES

Kuhlberg and Ryan and Morris—
Three regular Joes;
And to a worker—they hit him
Like a smack upon his nose.
Kuhlberg and Ryan and Morris—
The (best ??) you've ever seen in your life;

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

Address

Waterfront Worker

P. O. Box 1158, S. F., Calif.

They're after a worker's heart all right—

After it—With a Knife. (E. A. Poop)

Page 4 March 22nd, 1934

Waterfront Worker

(Cartoon—Worker's Wife: Husbands and wives solidarity.)

A MILITANT WIFE SPEAKS AN APPEAL TO ALL WOMEN

Editor Waterfront Worker:

I am the wife of a longshoreman and being his wife I am going to fight with him in the coming struggle. This is not only the fight of our husbands, but the fight of every woman whose men work on the waterfront, be it husband, father or son, therefore like my husband I stand 100% in favor of the coming strike, which is our only way out of our uncertainty & to a great extent our misery.

I wish to make this letter an appeal to all wives and mothers—who have men working on the waterfront to join with them in their struggles and to understand the reasons why and how the men have to fight.

I am ready and willing to take my place alongside my husband on the picket line and in the fight for relief or in any way in which I can help.

We women have been silent long enough, it is

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

time for us to act, for the men's problems are our problems. Their victory is our victory, their defeat is our defeat. We should organize the women to collect and distribute relief and to help in any manner in which they can. This fight isOur fight.

So once again in closing I appeal to all women to support and aid the men.

The fighting wife of a Fighting Stevedore.
Editor P. S.

Wives have had to suffer thru the system of keeping longshoremen waiting around for hours awaiting orders when to report at work. This system has been very beneficial to the liquor sellers as many longshoremen while waiting are tempted to drink & spend perhaps most of their wages. Another good reasons why we mustWin our demands for job control and hiring from the I. L. A. Hall.

WORKERS! AWAKEN!

The convention is all over
We learned quite a few tricks
Shipowners & Fakirs though they
are
Made lots of silly ships.
The big chiefs hate the progressive groups
The Radical Communist tribe
They are not so easy let astray
With a present or a bribe
The Labor Fakirs say Ahmen!

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

We have trouble too with this bunch
Whenever we try to put one over
They are the first to have a hunch
You suppose to pay your dues per month
No matter how little you work
Be very quite at the meetings
And keep praying to the Lord.
Ryan, Morris & Byorklund
Commanders from border to border
Are ruling with an iron hand
To enforce everything they order
Even shame oh! Shame Holman
Has seen the writing on the wall
If any one has to be appointed
I am the chief I do it all
I am sorry to disappoint you
Distroy your illusing of Power
But when you study History
You know what can happen in one hour
The fog over the toilers is clearing
The sky is nice and blue
Let this be a friendly warning
There is even hope for you
The Orders you are carrying out
Is all for the A. F. of L.
Reactionary officials?
And is hading to Hell
Any worker who wants to address our meeting
Without the seal of the A. F. of L.
Is stopped by orders of the 101 per cent

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

Of his experience he cannot tell
There is something in those verses
When you're on strike your credentials are hot
You're facing the Law of the Mighty
And your papers wouldn't stop any cop
The Son of Star gang stevedore

March 22nd, 1934 Page 5

Waterfront Worker

Hangman LEAVING

Editor Waterfront Worker:

What will become of all the Blue Book bosses on 39 when the Hangman leaves? Only Preacher Larsen knows and he's not telling. It looks like the Blue Book is going to; then what will happen? The Preacher says they'll all join Judge Rutherfords army selling books. Preacher Larsen is an expert book seller and after a few lessons from him the Blue Book force can make their living selling "Moses' Books".

The Preacher don't look for any extra work, he would sooner go around and pester people with his fanatic literature. Since the Blue Book got sick, he spends most of his time running between Pier 39 and the Blue Book. The Preacher knows all the bad sides about the I. L. A. and nothing but "good" about the Blue Book, in fact, he thinks he knows it all.

After the Blue Book is rubbed out, you had bet-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

ter stick to Moses, Preacher, the I. L. A. don't want you.

A Steyedore, Pier 39.

(Cartoon—Red (to lady): Just Slightly Used, Madame. Judge: That's the Way, Red. Wicks: I Have to Peddle Mine, Too.)

GANGS WALK OFF PIER 45
BOSS BEGS MEN TO GO BACK

Last week 4 California gangs were working across the Bay and men were ordered back to 45 at eleven o'clock, but due to fog the ship did not get in until 2 o'ck. Arvid Anderson sent 2 gangs aboard a quaker boat which had 2 hours left and the other 2 gangs were sent aboard the golden ship, this move would beat the 2 gangs outof about 2 hours waiting time and the stevedores like true I. L. A. men refused to turn to and be beat out of their money. When the other gangs heard about it they refused to take off the hatches and walked off too. Arvid Anderson began to plead and beg the men not to walk off but to come back and go to work. The men went back only to their original ships.

This is the kind of action that will win better working condition

(Cut of rat.)

AN ANSWER TO SCABBY PETERSON

The Waterfront Employees Union has been car-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

rying paid advertisements in all newspapers statingThat the longshoremen are very unfair in asking for coastwise negotiations and a coastwise agreement. The Shipowners state they have no authority to speak for the Pacific Coast. They also state that it is illegal according to Gen. Johnson, to ask for a closed shop. These statements are deliberate lies on the part of the shipowners.

The Pacific Coast steamship Operators Association organizes and calls the rate conferences which sets the passenger and freight rates for the Pacific Coast. The newspaper advertisements is an attempt to misinform the men that the shipowners have no right to speak for the coast, this is an absolute lie.

Scabby claims it is illegal for the I. L. A. to ask for a closed shop although the Blue Book has maintained a closed shop for 14 years with the men being forced to pay dues and accept its scabby rule.

The fact that Gen. Johnson, as quoted by the Waterfront Federation, made the statement that it is illgal to have a closed shop this should prove to the workers that the N. R. A. is a scabby document, as all the rulings made are in favor of the employers. These facts were pointed out by the Waterfront Worker last July.

We must asnwer the shipowners, Scabby Peterson and his stool pigeons with a solid, united fight-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

ing front with the stevedores organized strongly behind the I. L. A. under rank and file control.

Break the stranglehold the shipowners have on the Marine Workers.

LOST STRAYED OR STOLEN

One perfectly good slightly used poet, long black hair, brown soulful eyes, soiled white shirt flowing black tie, about medium height and wistful mouth; many girls call him their dream man. When last seen the wonder man was searching for a partner for the nudist colony—take worning, Lee if any particulars notify immediately the waterfront worker. P.O. Bos 1158—S.F. P.S. His family is frantic with grief. The dream man answers to the name of Edgar Allan Poop.

(Continued from colume one)

for the men on the waterfront, and shows that the stevedores are militant fighting men.

Page 6 March 22nd, 1934

Waterfront Worker

The Waterfront Worker
Is Published by a Group
of Rank and File Stevedores—Members of the ILA
Send All News . . Articles . . . .
and Donations to:
P. O. Box 1158
San Francisco
California . . . .

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

(Cut of the Mail Bag.)

MESSAGE FROM STEAM SCHOONER MAN

Editor Waterfront Worker:

I am a steam schooner sailor and want to say that the men on the schooners are plenty disgusted with conditions. Every day we work 10-12-14 hours and if we happen to have a 4 to 8 watch when we come into port we have to work 16 hours at a stretch. The pay runs around $45.00 a month and 40c an hour for overtime after 8 hours. When we take aboard oil we used to get overtime for handling the oil hose and for standing by when we were oiling but all that has been stopped now. Almost every schooner has from 1 to 4 I.L.A. men aboard and it is no doubt when the stevedores hang the hook we will too. We have nothing to lose we are barely making a living, and I want to say in closing that the steam schooner sailors are not scabs but are behind the longshoremen in their fight.

An I.L.A. STEAM SCHOONER SAILOR.

Ed's Notes: When the strike is called, the steam schooner sailors should go on strike but do not leave the ship in case you are forced off the ship you must picket the dock when the ship is tied up. Do not just walk off the ship in sympathy with the longshoremen but present to the shipowners the demands of the crew.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

PREPARE AGAINST POLICE TERROR

Already Thomas Plant, the spokesman for the shipowners, has made the statement that the S. F. Police will be used against the union stevedores. Chief Quinn has also stated that the police detail at Harbor station has been increased.

These preparations mean but one thing and that is the shipowners mean to protect their profits even if it means the shedding of the worker's blood.

The stevedores cannot take this lying down, we must be ready to defend ourselves against all attacks of the shipowners and their agents.

We must stand up like men and fight for the right to organize, strike and picket and to defend our right to struggle to better our conditions.

(continued from Page 1)

2—The Strike Committee to get in touch with Strike Committees in other Ports.

3— Each member of the Strike Committee to carry the decisions of the committee back to the men on the docks and get their endorsement.

4— On the basis of the endorsement of the men, the Strike Committee will make its final decisions.

WE MUST PREPARE STRIKES TO WIN

UNITE!! STRUGGLE!! WIN!!

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

SOLIDARITY OFFER OF W. I. R.

Royce, the Workers International Relief organizer, brought a message and expression of true working class solidarity when he spoke at our Special Strike Meeting.

He stated that he had been busy and had the backing of the United Front Conference forUnemployment Insurance and the Continuation of CWA Jobs. This Conference is composed of 45 organizations. 15 AFofL Trade Unions, 4 Unemployed Organizations, CWA workers organization, Marine Workers Industrial Union, and 5 other Industrial Unions, the International Labor Defense, the Communist Party and various other organizations.

(Cut of tearing up of Ryan Plan Shipowners' Code by Strike!)

March 22nd, 1934 Page 7

Waterfront Worker

KULBERG BLOCKS MOVE FOR UNITY

Editor Waterfront Worker:

The most disgraceful thing I have ever seen took place at our last regular meeting when the 9 sailors were refused the floor. I had sailed for many years and I was in the 1921 strike here in Frisco. I want to say here and now that I do not blame those sailors for joining the Marine Workers In-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

dustrial Union and refusing to have anything to do with the P.S.U. Didn't Andy Fursueth, "the old man of the Sea" have the cops beat up the young sailors and throw them out of the meeting when they wanted to keep up the strike when they had a chance to win? Andy Fursueth had that done and now the great leader Kulberg wants to chance the sailors back into Andy's arms. Say who is this guy Kulberg anyway to be shouting for the A. F. of L. anyway? Wasn't he an organizer for the I. W. W. at one time? It's damn funny he should change over so sudden. It must be the $10.00 a day, in other words he will serve any master who has the money. Your paper had a picture of Kulberg heading back for Cardiff, what is the meaning of this? Let us know. I have been a longshoreman for many years and I want to see one strike where the stevedores and sailors strike together. Lets go out together.

Yours for a Successful Strike, One of Andy Fursueth's Boys Educated in the 1921 Strike.

(Cartoon—Unity With Stevedores. Boyce: Scabby Don't Want Unity 'Tween Seamen and Longshoremen. Kulberg: Go Away! Paddy Says You Are a Dual Organization.)

We like to inform Mr. Kulberg that depite his manouvers to split the unity of seamen and longshoremen, the seamen will back up the stevedores 100%.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

PEDRO PETE
DICKERS WITH THE LABOR BOARD

Reports come up from Pedro, that Pete, "the wonder man", has approached the Regional Labor Board of Southern California to see if San Pedro could sigh an agreement with the shipowners and let the coastwise negotiations go by the board.

If such reports are true, we would like to know how much money it took to buy Pedro Pete? If Pedro Pete can be judged by his actions in the I.L.A. convention acting as servant boy to Paddy Morriss and as a "Yes man" to "old lady" Bjorklund, we would say the price of a package of Bull would be a big price. Pedro Pete you have to prove you are on the up and up—your past record is against you. Anything can be believed of a servant boy of your caliber.

P.S. Anyway you always remain a louse.

BIG EMIL THE FOOTBALL STAR

Emil Larson claims he has 19 gangs ready to scab when the stevedores go on strike. We wonder where Big Emil got all the scabs? Could they be from Union Square? Or these husky he men from the Dugout Cafe?

We hear rumors that recruiting of scabs is going on in the Old Men's Home, too.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

You can't build football teams with the Powell St. Hill Billies or keep up tonnage with the chorus boys from the Dugout Cafe. Emil, we think you are—phtt—

(Cartoon—Big Emil and His Scabs.)

The W. W. has criticized many gaffers, and surely they deserve criticism, but there is at least one boss on the front who is a gentleman who treats the men as men, and that is Brown at the Admiral docks. Brown does not razz the boys continuously but patiently talks to the boys and shows them how to work lumber. Brown, we's like to shake you by the hand. Let's have more men of Brown's type on the front.

Page 8 March 22, 1934

Waterfront Worker

NEWS FROM PEDRO!!!

(Cartoon—Pedro Pete With Strike Ballot No. X.)

NAPOLEON RETURNS FROM THE WARS

Editor S.F. Waterfront Worker:

Pedro Pete has returned with his army of four trusted captains from the Pacific Coast ILA. Convention. Pete in reporting did not say anything what the convention did or the program adopted, all he said was that there were 16 Communists on the Frisco delegation and Pete and Paddy Morris stopped the Communists in wrecking the ILA. He

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

also said that these shipowners did not want to do business with the Frisco ILA because the men are too radical.

We got hold of a copy of the Frisco Waterfront Worker and the picture of Pete down on his knees before Paddy Morris is fine.

That's Pete all over—you stevedores in Frisco should have taken up a collection and bought him a new set of Knee-pads, his old ones are about wore out.

In looking over the minutes of the convention the men in Pedro can see why the shipowners called the Frisco Stevedores radicals, the Frisco delegation were the only ones to put up the demands of the men and they sure fought for the men all thru the convention. Pete has ruled the Pedro Local with an iron hand But We Are Beginning to See Thru the "Little Napoleon".

You fellows in Frisco keep up the fight, the progressives in Pedro are behind you and will stick to the last ditch.

A Progressive Pedro Longshoreman.

Address

Waterfront Worker

B. O. Box 1158, S. F. Calif.

PEDRO PETE—THE LABOR LEADER!

Editor Waterfront Worker:

A number of lumber ships coming into Pedro will not hire men from the Fink Hall lists so the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

prospectors on the beach work these ships regularly. The lumber handlers thought it best if the ILA would run a lumber list and the men made the suggestion to Pete. What does Pete do but go to the Mr. Nichols and asks the king snipe of the Fink Hall for permission to run the lumber list thru the Fink Hall. This action shows what kind of a labor leader this guy Pedro Pete is. He is always running to the government officials, and he is always worrying about the poor shipowners. Pete says the men should be patient and take thing easy, the government will make the bad shipowners toe the mark. As a rank and file stevedore of San Pedro, I want to tell the coast stevedores that the men are fed up with Pete, Patterson and Hull. These baloneys have shot enough hot air into us and we are ready to stick to the demands of the men and to hell with the National Industrial Labor Board and compulsary arbitration.

A Stevedore Who Should Have Been a Delegate to the ILA Convention.

Editor Waterfront Worker:

Reading your paper, I sure agree with you about the necessity of united action by seamen and longshoremen. Being a seaman who has been sailing on this coast off and on for about 12 years, I can see the need of sticking together with the stevedores very plainly now, when the shipowners will try every way to get us to scab on the stevedores, but

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 285—(Continued)

most of the seamen I talked to in the last couple of weeks all promised not to scab. I think one thing the I.L.A. should be sure to keep a strong watch on the scabby Fink Hall as they will try to recruit scabs right away.

A Seaman on the Beach, Who Will Be in the Picket Line.

OLD TIMERS SHOW SOLIDARITY

Various dock superintendents have approached old timers on the Beach to see if they would take gangs. But we are glad to report that the old timers have turned down the offers and are going to stick with the stevedores.

[Endorsed]: Filed June 2, 1942.

Mr. Del Guercio: And I would like to substitute a photostatic copy.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Were there any paid advertisements appear- in the Waterfront Worker?

A. I think there were on occasions.

Q. And would they so state that they were paid advertisements? A. I don't remember that.

Q. Let me show you another article in this Waterfront Worker, appearing on page 6——

(Passing publication to Mr. Gladstein.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: This is Government's Exhibit 285.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing): ——and the heading "Solidarity Offer of W.I.R."

What is the "W.I.R."?

A. Workers International Relief.

Q. Was that a Communist Party organization?

A. Not that I know of. I only remember it very briefly. It was on the waterfront, or had representatives on the waterfront for a very brief time. That is all I remember about it.

Q. You heard testimony in this hearing here that the [5912] Workers International Relief was a Communist organization, haven't you?

A. I have heard it said here.

Q. Now, who wrote this article regarding the "Solidarity Offer of W.I.R."?

A. (Examining article): I don't know specifically who wrote the article, but I remember the incident.

Q. Could it have been Harry Jackson?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Could it have been Sam Darcy? A. No.

Q. Could it have been Elaine Black?

A. No.

Q. Did you write it?

A. No, not that I remember.

Q. Somebody wrote it?

A. If I recall writing it I would have no hesitation in saying that I did.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Somebody did write it?

A. Oh, sure; somebody wrote it for the Waterfront Worker and sent it in; or one of the people connected, or concerned with the Waterfront Worker wrote it, and I can't remember.

Q. Who had the say about what was to appear in this Waterfront Worker? [5913]

A. Well, it was never, it was never very tight. Everything was printed in the paper as it came in—even articles attacking the paper. You will find, if you look through the various issues of the paper, you will find articles in there attacking the paper.

Q. Do you have any such issues of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I have no issues of it in that respect; but I am sure, if you have a file of them, you will find many of them like that.

Q. And you don't know then who wrote this particular article? A. No, I don't.

Q. It might have been sent in by Jackson?

A. Well, of course—I guess that is possible.

Q. Now, did you read the article? A. Yes.

Q. Let me read it for the purpose of the record, and it might refresh your memory:

"Royce"——

You know who Royce is?

A. I remember him.

Q. Who is he?

Presiding Inspector: He said he remembers the incident. What is the use of reading the article? If you want the incident [5914] why don't you ask him?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I have another reason for reading the article.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. There is a reference in this article to the International Labor Defense? A. Yes.

Q. What was the International Labor Defense?

A. The International Labor Defense.

Q. Was that a Communist organization?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. You have heard testimony in this hearing to the effect that it is a Communist Party organization?

A. You have got to differentiate between the testimony being given here and what the real facts are.

Q. What are the real facts, as you know them, in regard to the International Labor Defense?

A. Not a Communist organization.

Q. You know that of your own knowledge?

A. I know it as an ordinary person. I was never a member of the organization. I just know the activities of the International Labor Defense as it applies to our trade union movement.

Q. Do you know of the activities of the International Labor Defense during the 1934 strike? [5915]

A. Yes; and in many other cases too.

Q. You had dealings with the International Labor Defense during the 1934 strike. A. Yes.

Q. And with whom in the International Labor Defense? A. Elaine Black.

Q. Elaine Black? A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Where was Elaine Black's office during the 1934 strike? A. 121 Haight Street.

Q. 121 Haight Street? A. Yes.

Q. You knew Elaine Black to be a member of the Communist Party, did you not? A. I did not.

Q. When did you find that out?

A. I don't recall, but some time later.

Q. How much later?

A. I don't remember that. I think it was around after the strike, or many months after the strike.

Q. And she occupied offices at 121 Haight Street, the headquarters of the Communist Party?

A. I think she was the Secretary, or the ranking official that did the business for the International Labor Defense at that time. [5916]

Q. How many times did you go to see Elaine Black at 121 Haight Street? A. Only once.

Q. When was that? A. 1934.

Q. What month? A. May.

Q. Was it during the 1934 strike or after the strike had been called?

A. After the strike had been called.

Q. And what was the occasion of you going to see Elaine Black at 121 Haight Street?

A. I was sent up by the Strike Committee.

Q. Who from the Strike Committee sent you up there? A. The Strike Committee; all of them.

Q. Was there a vote taken? A. Yes.

Q. Did you have the minutes of that Strike Committee? A. I don't know if I could get them.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you ever advocate sending yourself up to see Elaine Black?

A. I don't remember. I was the Chairman of the Committee. They used to do pretty well without me advocating things.

Q. You say you were chosen to go up to see Elaine Black [5917] at 121 Haight Street, is that right?

A. I was one of the committee that went up there.

Q. How many were on the Committee?

A. Myself, Dietrich, and a third person.

Q. Now—and this was done at the meeting of the Strike Committee?

A. Official meeting of the Strike Committee.

Q. Did you preside as Chairman at the time?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you propose your own name?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. How did the question of going to the International Labor Defense, or going to 121 Haight Street to see Elaine Black, of the International Labor Defense, come up?

A. At that time we were attempting, we were attempting to set up a defense structure to protect our people. There was three or four recommendations of the best way to do it. Fred Heiner, who testified, was a member of the Defense Committee, and he was suggesting one attorney; Dietrich was suggesting another attorney. The ILD had made an offer.

To investigate the three offers—they are the three that I remember—the Strike Committee sent this

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Committee up to investigate, to see what was the best thing to do. They brought back a recommendation, in connection with the ILD, against using the ILD, and that was concurred in. [5918]

Q. That was your committee, wasn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. And you went up to 121 Haight Street, in accordance with the mandate, or dictates of that strike Committee? A. Right.

Q. And who did you see? A. Elaine Black.

Q. Anyone else? A. I don't remember.

Q. Who was the spokesman for the Committee?

A. Our Committee?

Q. Yes—you were on the committee?

A. Yes. I think we all spoke. I think Dietrich was the spokesman, as much as anybody else.

Q. Did you speak? A. I am sure I did.

Q. To whom? A. Elaine Black.

Q. Now, what did you say to Elaine Black?

A. Oh, I think we—I don't recall any specific conversation. I am sure that we told her we were up there as a result of the action of the Strike Committee to ask her to explain what their proposals were for proper defense of any strikers that were arrested, or got into trouble in any way.

After they had explained the whole thing to us we reported [5919] back to the Strike Committee.

Q. After "they"——

A. (Interposing): After she explained the whole thing to us.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Is it possible that Sam Darcy was there at the time? A. Not that I recall.

Q. Is it possible that Harry Jackson was there?

A. I have no recollection of Harry Jackson being there either. I am sure he wasn't.

Q. But Darcy might have been there?

A. He might have been in the building, or somewhere around. I only recall meeting with Elaine Black alone, and no one else.

Q. You said that an offer had been made by the ILD? A. Yes.

Q. Some time prior to your going to this 121 Haight Street? A. Right.

Q. Who made the offer and to whom was it made?

A. My recollection is that Elaine Black came down to the Union headquarters at some time, even before the strike broke out, or she came down before the Strike Committee, and made this proposal. As a result of her appearance this Committee was sent up to investigate.

Q. Did she appear before the Union or before your [5920] Strike Committee, or did she appear before both?

A. I am not sure. She either appeared before the Union or the Strike Committee. I think it was the Strike Committee.

Q. And you were there? A. Yes.

Q. What did she propose?

A. She proposed to utilize the International Labor Defense for the proper and adequate defense of

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

any person who got into trouble with the law during the strike.

Q. And did she tell you who the attorneys for the ILD were at that time?

A. I am not sure. Possibly she did. I don't remember that particularly.

Q. You know, don't you, who the attorneys for the ILD were at that time?

A. I think George Anderson was the leading attorney.

Q. Anyone else?

A. I don't remember any others.

Q. Now, you heard the testimony of your witness, Heiner, regarding the same incident? A. Yes.

Q. Did he testify truthfully regarding that same incident?

A. I wouldn't say that he was testifying in any other [5921] way, because his remembering of what happened and mine happens to be different. I am giving you my best recollection.

Q. But they both couldn't be the same, could they?

Mr. Gladstein: I think that is argumentative.

Presiding Inspector: That is for the trier of the fact and not for the witness.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Isn't it true that Elaine Black spoke at the convention of the longshoremen in 1934, February, 1934?

A. She might have; I don't remember off-hand.

Q. That was before the 1934 strike?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That was in February, 1934; yes.

Q. That wasn't the union, was it, your union, Local union?

A. That was a Coast Convention, Pacific Coast District Convention.

Q. And you were there?

A. I was a delegate there.

Q. You were a delegate? A. Yes.

Q. Don't you know if Elaine Black appeared before that convention and spoke?

A. I can't remember that well. It is entirely possible she did. It is entirely possible. I can easily check it up. I have the official minutes. [5922]

Q. Could you check that?

A. And how! I will check it.

Q. Will you please do that and be prepared to come in this afternoon with that information?

A. I will give you the minutes. You can look through them.

Q. Then you wouldn't know right now what Elaine Black spoke about?

A. I wouldn't be able to say with any certainty. There is no use guessing as long as I can look up the minutes and definitely find out.

I think the Marine Workers Industrial Union spoke there too.

Q. Do you know Bill Dunne?

A. I have met Bill Dune.

Q. When did you meet him?

A. Some time in New York, and fairly recently.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I forget the particularly occasion,—I was introduced to him.

Q. Who introduced you to him?

A. I don't remember that. It was at some social gathering, or some union dance, or something.

Q. Well, now, if it was a social gathering where would it have been?

A. Well, I am not that well enough acquainted with New York to say. [5923]

Q. At whose social gathering were you at the time? A. At whose?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, as I say, my recollection is it was some union social affair. I recall being introduced to Bill Dunne.

Q. You met him, you say, recently. Can you place it more definitely?

A. I am trying to place it right now. It was during one of my trips east; I will say within the last couple of years.

Q. Within the last couple of years—1939?

A. I doubt if it would be that long.

Q. Was it prior to your last hearing in 1939?

A. I don't think it was. I think it was afterwards.

Q. How long after? A. I don't know.

Q. Would you say it was the latter part of 1939?

A. It is possible.

Q. You were in New York the latter part of 1939?

A. No—I am not sure about that. I was back and forth to New York quite a bit.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Can you put it more definitely than you have as to——

A. (Interposing): No. That is pretty hard. After all, I meet a person, get introduced to them and——

Q. (Interposing): Who was Bill Dunne? [5924]

A. Bill Dunne—I think the main reason I know him, he was one of the Dunne brothers of Minneapolis.

Q. Is he also the Dunne of the Communist Party.

A. He is the same Dunne, that Bill Dunne of the Communist Party. That is one branch—after all, things kind of get mixed up. They all claim that they are Communists—Vincent Dunne, and the other Dunne brother, and Bill Dunne.

Q. The Bill Dunne of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know that.

Q. What?

A. I don't know that. I know he is a trade unionist.

Q. You would know him as having been the member of the National Executive Committee of the AF of L at one time?

A. No, I don't know that. I am not sure of that.

Q. Were you ever—— (pause)

Presiding Inspector: Where?

Mr. Del Guercio: I was just thinking—strike that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you know Bill Dunne prior to this time that you met him in New York? A. No.

Q. In the last couple of years? A. No.

Q. Did the Waterfront Worker ever carry anything about [5925] Bill Dunne during the time that you and your group of longshoremen were putting it out?

A. I don't know that; I don't remember. It is impossible for me to remember all these references to individual people that the Waterfront carried.

Q. Do you know of the Butte, Montana incident connected with Bill Dunne?

A. Not particularly.

Q. What?

A. I remember they were on a strike in 1934, the miners up there.

Q. Do you recall now that Bill Dunne being a militant leader of that strike in Butte, Montana?

A. No; not particularly.

Q. Let me refresh your recollection. I have here Government's Exhibit 250, the Waterfront Worker for December 1, 1934, and there appears on the first page of this Waterfront Worker an article under this heading, "A Birthday Party", the following:

"Come to the birthday party. Waterfront birthday party, Saturday nite, January 5th—8:00 P.M. at Albion Hall, 145 Albion Street,—around the corner from Duggan's Funeral Parlors.

"The Waterfront Worker is going to celebrate its 3rd birthday by holding a meeting at Albion Hall,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Saturday Night. [5926] For this memorable occasion, the Waterfront Worker has invited Wm. F. Dunne, one of the foremost trade-union authorities in America, to speak and explain the West Coast Maritime Strike and the Great San Francisco General Strike. Many workers are acquainted with Dunne already, knowing him for his militant history in Butte, Montana, and as a militant member of the National Executive Committee of the A.F. of L." [5927]

Now, does that refresh your memory as to when you first met William F. Dunne? A. Yes.

Q. Then the first time that you met William F. Dunne was not in 1939, recently, as you have testified, but you met him in 1934, didn't you?

A. No, I never. I didn't meet him on that occasion. After all, that was a question of inviting a trade union leader to speak, and I didn't meet him—I recall distinctly—I was sorry I didn't.

Q. You remember distinctly that you weren't there on that occasion?

A. I am sure I wasn't, and I remember that meeting; and there was no harm in having a meeting. It was December, '34. Dunne was in town and he just came from some place or other. But I never met him.

Q. How did you know that Dunne was in town?

A. Apparently that article—I can remember that much.

Q. Do you remember anything except what it says in that article?

A. I recall the celebration, and the meeting here.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I think, if you will look in other copies you will find out who was there at that meeting and who else spoke.

Q. Were you there at the meeting?

A. I was not. [5928]

Q. Where were you?

A. I don't exactly know where I was. I wasn't at the meeting.

Q. You know you weren't at the meeting, but you don't know where you were?

A. Listen—maybe it was on the December 23 when I was supposed to be in Fresno.

Q. That is very possible. A. Yes.

Q. You remember now being in Fresno, do you?

A. No.

Q. At the Communist Party convention in Fresno?

A. I am sure I wasn't there, and if you had not put it on Sunday I would have proved it too.

Q. As a matter of fact, this William F. Dunne was in San Francisco all of the 1934 strike, wasn't he, the general strike, for the three days of the general strike?

A. During the three days of the general strike?

Q. Yes. A. Not that I know of.

Q. How long did the general strike last?

A. It lasted about four days.

Q. About four days? A. Yes.

Q. Was William F. Dunne here?

A. I don't know. [5929]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Huh? A. I don't know.

Q. Maybe Government's Exhibit 191 will refresh your memory.

A. I saw that in the last hearing, that pamphlet.

Q. You did? A. Yes.

Q. You have read this (referring to Government's Exhibit 191) before?

A. Yes. I read it some time before the last hearing. I read it also during the last hearing too. I mean I read the entire pamphlet during the last hearing.

Q. Who wrote Government's Exhibit 191?

A. Supposed to be written by William F. Dunne.

Q. You knew that?

A. Listen, I am not exactly dumb. I remember that much.

Q. I know that.

A. I have seen this pamphlet, and it was written by Bill Dunne.

Q. Did he state the correct happenings of the 1934 strike, as stated here?

A. If I remember correctly, in most respects; but there were certain respects that he didn't.

Q. Can you tell me what are the respects in which he [5930] didn't correctly state them?

A. You read it and I will tell you. I can't remember that well.

Q. I don't want to take the time to read it all.

A. I will read it through and come back and tell you.

Q. Now, he states here on page 5:

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"The Marine Workers Industrial Union—affiliated to the Trade Union Unity League—raised the question of a general strike."

Is that true?

A. Raised it with whom—at their own union? If they raised it at their own union I guess it is true.

Q. (Reading):

"The Left Wing in the leadership of the ILA"——

That is you, isn't it?

A. Oh, I think you would call me a member of the Left Wing before you would of the Right.

Q. (Reading):

" . . . and the Joint Strike Committee of the Waterfront Unions, headed by Harry Bridges"——

That was you? A. That is me.

Q. (Reading):

" . . . in San Francisco, endorsed the proposal to call upon the Bay Counties' unions for a general strike." [5931]

Is that correct? A. Whose proposal?

Q. Is that correct?

A. Whose proposal—the first proposal for the general strike and the first movement for the general strike was made by the Joint Strike Committee.

Q. Then it goes on .

"Harry Bridges and the Committee of strikers brought the question of the general strike to the Central Labor Councils in San Francisco and Oakland."

Is that correct? A. Right.

Q. (Reading):

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"The official leaders endorsed it."

Is that correct?

A. What official leaders?

Q. "Opposed it," instead of "endorsed it."

A. The official leaders of what?

Q. I will read on:

"Bridges and the Committee then began a systematic canvass of all local unions affiliated to the Central Labor Councils."

Is that correct? A. Right.

Q. Now, even at that time you knew, did you not, that [5932] William F. Dunne was a militant Communist Party member?

A. No. I told you I didn't meet Dunne——

Q. (Interposing): This is the same Waterfront Worker. Did you ever use 37 Grove Street as a place where the Waterfront Worker could be purchased?

A. At no time—where it could be purchased?

Q. Yes.

A. That is possible. We tried to use a lot of places to have it purchased.

Q. Who made those arrangements?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. Would you have made the arrangements?

A. It is possible.

Q. And if you did, with whom did you make the arrangements? A. I don't know.

Q. Was it with Harry Jackson?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Just a question of having it put on the newspaper stand for sale up there.

Q. Let me show you here the issue of the Waterfront Worker for January 28, 1935——

(The issue referred to was passed to Mr. Gladstein.)

Q. (Continuing) ——And on page 5 of it appears this:

"Waterfront Worker outmaneuvers bosses.

[5933]

"Again the Waterfront Worker is printing a small part of Bill Dunne's famous pamphlet, 'The Great San Francisco General Strike.' Every worker should read this lively and intimate report on the second general strike in America.

"The pamphlet can be bought at 37 Grove Street, or from the Western Worker salesmen on the Front every day."

I want to apologize here. I deceived you. I thought it was the Waterfront Worker that you were putting on sale at 37 Grove Street, but apparently here you were advertising Communist literature on behalf of the Communist Party. I don't want to deceive you.

Having called your attention to this article here, can you tell me what it is about?

A. (Referring to article) Just the top article?

Q. Yes.

A. That is a boost for Bill Dunne's pamphlet on the San Francisco General Strike, with the suggestion that every worker should read the pamphlet.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. That is the pamphlet here? (Indicating).

A. It says where the pamphlet can be bought.

Q. This one? (Indicating).

A. Yes.

Q. "The Great San Francisco General Strike," by William F. Dunne; Government's Exhibit 191?

A. Yes, sir. [5934]

Q. Published by the Workers Library Publishers? A. Yes.

Q. Is that correct?

A. Yes; that is right.

I was looking through to see if we have any other ads about supporting any other papers. I am sure you will find them.

Q. Look and see if you can find any.

A. (Examining publication) Maybe not this one—but I might as well look while I have got it.

Q. Are you through looking?

A. Yes. I can't find any along the lines I was looking for. I am sure, if you will look through the various issues, you will find on occasion we urged that this, that, or the other particular publication be read, because it dealt in some way with the Waterfront, or our general problem.

Q. Did you collaborate with William F. Dunne in writing this book, "The Great San Francisco General Strike"?

A. No. If I had been asked I might have. I collaborated with a lot of people writing things about the waterfront.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. With how many members of the Communist Party have you collaborated in writing Communist Party literature?

A. None; not in writing Communist Party literature.

Q. Did anyone ask you to advertise the fact that this, [5935] Government's Exhibit No. 191, could be purchased at 37 Grove Street?

A. I don't know. Maybe we didn't need any asking. We figured it was a good enough pamphlet to advertise and support without being asked.

Q. "We figured"—who do you mean by "we"? Do you include yourself?

A. Yes; I include myself.

Q. Who else.

A. Everybody connected with the Waterfront Worker.

Q. Did your account of the San Francisco General Strike differ from William F. Dunne's account of it?

A. In some respects it does. I was in a better position to know about it than William F. Dunne, and still am.

Mr. Del Guercio: Excuse me. I am looking for a particular issue of the Waterfront Worker.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have here a copy of the Waterfront Worker for November 19, 1934.

(The publication was handed to Mr. Gladstein.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing): I want to call your attention to an article appearing on page 5, headed, "Hearst —Lying Editor [5936] of Gutter Press. Boycott all Yellow Sheets—Read Working Class Press. A Call-Bulletin Newsboy."

Who wrote that article—and at the end it says, "We remain very respectfully yours, The Editors, Waterfront Worker, P. O. Box 1158."

A. (Examining publication): It seems to me this is in answer—here is the first letter. Here is the letter (indicating) written in by a newsboy; and an answer was given in the paper to the letter written in by the newsboy.

Q. Who wrote this?

A. It reads—the particular individual?

Q. Yes. A. I don't know. [5937]

Q. Did you write it?

A. It doesn't look like my language, but it doesn't seem to be a bad article to me.

Q. You adopt everything that is said in there? You would have done the same thing?

A. Well, generally speaking, yes. I think it is a good article.

Mr. Gladstein: I suggest that the entire article be read to the witness and the witness be asked whether he disputes any part of it. The purpose is to obtain the witness' views.

Mr. Del Guercio: Is this an objection to the question?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: It is a suggestion to the procedure.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will have to let the counsel adopt his own course.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Let me read you a portion of this article.

Mr. Gladstein: We will object to the reading of any portion of the article which tears it out of its context.

Presiding Inspector: You can read the rest.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I want to call your attention particularly to this paragraph: "Ragged Newsboy, the workers never forget the injustices heaped upon them by the ruling class and their flunkies." Would you have written the same kind of a sentence in connection with this same matter? [5938]

A. Well, I mightn't have used the same words.

Q. The same thought?

A. Yes. When they call Hearst a "flunky" of somebody I think they are right. I'll say that.

Q. I am continuing: "The terror, the brutalities, the beatings, the jailings, the murders, are never forgotten"?

A. I think that's a true statement. You could go down and ask the fellows on the 'front.' They haven't forgotten.

Q. I will continue: "These impressions are stamped upon our minds forever and ever." They are stamped on your mind too, aren't they?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I sure remember them.

Q. Now, "One day soon those sadistic culprits shall answer before a Workers' Tribunal"?

A. I hope so.

Q. Huh? A. I hope so.

Q. You believe in the Workers' Tribunal, do you?

A. Well, part of that has been accomplished. There was a change of government in the State of California and some of them had to answer a little bit.

Q. That is the dictatorship of the proletariat?

A. Oh, you are reading something in there that is not there.

Q. I will continue, the last paragraph. [5939]

A. Yes.

Q. "Workers, read the working class press—The Western Worker printed twice weekly and the Daily Worker, the only working-class daily in America." Does that express your thought, too.

A. In preference to the Hearst press? Absolutely. I'll advocate that they read those papers before they would read and believe the Hearst press.

Q. Now, are you able to state who wrote that article? A. Specifically, no.

Q. As to the particular individual who was responsible for the article.

A. The group behind the Waterfront Worker, including myself.

Q. You would be responsible for it? You

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

wouldn't evade responsibility for this article, would you?

A. No, I don't think I could.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It will be received without objection.

(The paper referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 286.)

GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT No. 286

2 Cents

WATERFRONT WORKER

Volume II Number 35 November 19, 1934

San Francisco

LET'S ACHIEVE COAST UNITY

Don't Let The Shipowners Worsen Conditions

Upon looking over the situation and current events along the Front we must point out to the longshoremen that a critical situation exists on the Waterfront.

The S. F. longshoremen are certainly the most militant of any group existing along the Coast. The men in the other marine crafts are well aware of this and take advantage of the militancy existing in S. F.; for instance—seamen are continually striking their ships when arriving in S. F. knowing

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

they will receive full support from the S. F. longshoremen.

The employers accuse the

Page 2 Waterfront Worker November 9, 1934

I. L. A. of breaking the award—and accuse its leaders of being irresponsible because they support the men every time the longshoremen take action. The strikes occurring during the past ten or twelve days at the Dollar Docks, Piers 34 and 23, were deliberately provoked by the employers who tried to increase loads. They are doing this in order to worsen conditions, and if we fight back they pretend that we only want to make trouble.

The strikes mentioned above were caused mainly by the employers demanding that bigger loads be hoisted. They have been satisfied with small loads since the termination of the strike, but are suddenly taking an attitude of offensive; they may attempt a lock-out in this port, hoping of course that the other ports will not support S. F. The infamous Joe Ryan will certainly stab us in the back at the first chance he gets. We stopped him from selling out the strike last summer and Fink Ryan stepped out of the picture for awhile, but he left his loyal henchmen on the job. These boys are still with us and doing everything in their power to stop and hinder the work of the Relations Committee. The District officials, Lewis, Morris, Pedro Pete and the rest of those "officials" did nothing to organize and help win the strike. On the contrary, they

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

worked overtime to betray us. Now, they are working to split us up.

What is Lewis, drawing his $60:00 a week doing to build Coast unity. Nothing, on the contrary, he is trying to split the coast. Pedro Pete, another District official, is also sitting back doing the same thing. Why have such men represent us? Now is the time to build the Pacific Coast Federation. Now is the time to build in order to hold the gains we won through our splendid fight.

A leader is judged by the manner in which he leads his army. All Lewis was concerned with was to draw his $60.00 a week, which has got all during the strike and to "keep from being a playmate of Tom Mooney," as he said.

Temporarily a policy of watchful militancy be adopted by the S. F. longshoremen. The militant spirit existing must not be allowed to die. However, pull your punches for awhile so far as improving conditions further, but dont let the bosses worsen conditions. Let's keep status quo until our men on the board adopt working rules This should be done within a few days.

Remember, the employers want a group of meek workers along the Front, but meekness is something S. F. longshoremen do not possess.

The concentration of cops on the waterfront is ample proof that the shipowners are contemplating some dirty work; intimidation of the workers by

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

these methods is an old trick with which we are acquainted.

The "Marine Federation" must be made into a reality. The marine workers along the entire Coast must be drawn in—only by unity and solidarity can present conditions be retained and undesirable conditions eliminated.

Remember the good ship, I.L.A Local 38-79, is being held to her right course by your local militant leaders, but the employers and fakers are always trying to run the ship on the rocks.

[Cartoon] 15 cases Shipowners

Special Meeting
To-night 8 P.M.
Building Trade Temple

VERY IMPORTANT

November 19, 1934 Waterfront Worker Page 3

ON THE SPOT
WANTED AT ONCE:

Remedies to remove discoloring from eyes, ache from sore jaws, back, sides and hips—not caused from hard work. Also prescription to stop pain in gums, when sound teeth have suddenly been extracted.

Send all remedies immediately if not sooner, to Captain Gates or Captain Smith, C/o Swayne & Hoyt.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

A WORD OF ADVICE

Overtime Fred, on Pier 26 wants 6 oil drums to aload Follow the stock market, Fred—What price creosote or arnica?

CHANGE OF NAME

By request "The Producer" announces that hereafter he should be addressed as "The Reducer."

SPECIAL COP MALONEY

Young Maloney, driving jitney for the Calif. Stev. Co. at Pier 28, seems to be displaying a great amount of courage these days. During the General Strike this same man sold his services as a special cop, joining a machine set up to destroy the workers, and when the strike was over, young Maloney, through the influence of his Pa and Uncle, Ed and Jack Malony, who are big shots at Piers 28 and 38, respectively, was brought in to share the improved working conditions won by our militant workers.

Fate does play a peculiar game at times for Jack Malony came very close to receiving a good beating along with some more finks whom he had hired at a hotel on Fillmore Street during the strike. He escaped this thrashing by a bare few minutes, but never mind, Maloney, fate will not always be so kind to your kind and maybe after dishing out a good beating to one of the family it will have the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

effect of sapping some of the courage from your special cop off-springs.

"LOYAL EMPLOYEE" SAILS EAST

Jack Miske, one of the loyal employees of the Grace Co. has been transferred to New York. The weather here has proven very unhealthy. It is rumored that Scabby Jack is going to the dock where the social climber, Ryan, got his start. "Sellout" Ryan can teach Scabby Jack many lessons in the art of finking.

[Cartoon] Captain Smith All right Boys Six to a Sling.

FIVE AT A TIME

A stevedore asked Captain Smith if he was going to demand six drums to a load. Smith replied "Yes". The stevedores said, "Here's five now" - - - WHAM.

TIGER THE MAN-EATER

We wonder why there are always new men in Tiger's Gang. Is it possible that he rides 'em too much?

Write for the Waterfront Worker—Post Office Box # 1158—San Francisco

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridg...)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

Page 4 Waterfront Worker November 19, 1934

NEWS BOY CALLS FOR FAIR PLAY CHARGES UNION MEN SMOKE FINK CIGARETTES

The Waterfront Worker

Gentlemen:

Why do you boycott the Hearst newspapers? Why do most all Unions boycott a Union newspaper? Is it because you didn't like the editorials written by Mr. Hearst during the last strike? I didn't like them myself, and I sell a Hearst paper.

Wasn't it Abraham Lincoln who said, "You can please some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't please all of the people all of the time?" And truer words were never spoken.

You are not hurting Mr. Hearst a great deal because the advertisements almost pay for the cost of the paper. You are only hurting the newsboy. And believe me the newsboys have a hard enough time now to make a living.

You Union men have no scruples to borrowing money from these same newsboys.

The most of you Union men who smoke cigarettes smoke either Lucky Strikes, Chesterfields or Camels, and they are absolutely Non-Union. I firmly believe you have a sense of fair play, so why don't

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

you play fair with your newsboys. Hoping you will print this but afraid you will not.

I am very respectfully yours,

A Call-Bulletin Newsboy

November 19, 1934 Waterfront Worker Page 5

HEARST—LYING EDITOR OF GUTTER PRESS

BOYCOTT ALL YELLOW SHEETS—READ WORKING CLASS PRESS

A Call-Bulletin Newsboy

Sir:

In answer to your pathetic plea for justice of "poor" Mr. Hearst, please bear with us while we answer your question: "Why do you boycott the Hearst newspaper"?

This question could be answered very simply and truthlyfully by stating, the Hearst newspapers are the most vicious, lying, strike breaking, anti-working class, yellow-sheets ever printed, which are owned and edited by a liar, a forger, a war-monger, red-baiting, union busting scoundrel—Wm. Randolph Hearst.

Because the Waterfront Worker is a paper published by a group of militant longshoremen, who realize that the great masses of workers must be made conscious of their own strength and power therefore, it is to the interest of all maritime workers and to all workers that we add to the knowledge

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

gained through the bitter struggle of the maritime strike of last summer, so we will further analyze why every class-conscious worker should not only boycott Hearst newspapers but all yellow capitalist rags.

To begin with, Mr. Hearst represents and is spokesman for the Capitalist or Boss-class. We are workers, therefore, Mr. Hearst and the longshoremen have nothing in common.

During the Maritime Strike, the newspapers played a vile part in villifying and slandering the heroic strike leaders. The yellow-press out-did themselves in heaping dirt and abuse upon those courageous fellows and leading the pack of yelping jackals was the Hearst gutter-press.

The Hearst newspapers supported one of the blackest reactionnaires ever to run for office in the U.S. and when he was elected Governor, proudly boasted that the Hearst papers helped to elect him. That man (?) "So I took the $30,000" is now Governor of our glorious state.

During the time of the vigilante raids on Workers Centers thru-out the Bay Region, Hearst reporters played an important role. Photographs were taken showing these "Gentlemen" gleefully helping the police and other hoodlums smash the working-class halls.

Ragged newsboy, the workers never forget the injustices heaped upon them by the ruling class and their flunkies. The terror, the brutalities, the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

beatings, the jailings, the murders, are never forgotten—these impressions are stamped upon our minds forever and ever. One day soon those sadistic culprits shall answer before a Workers' Tribunal. Yes, poor newsboys, one day soon.

Sure the newsboys have it tough; all workers have a tough time to make a living. The boss forces the workers to toil for miserable wages so he can have a larger profit, but the workers must Organize and demand a decent living wage.

Most Union men smoke but they do not all smoke non-union cigarettes. Twenty-Grand, Wings and Clowns are union made smoke and more and more the workers are turning to these.

Yes, we have a sense of fair play, not only to the newsboys, but to all workers. First of all the newsboys must be fair to themselves. Do they want to continue to be exploited by a tyrant, such as Hearst, or are they going to get together with others of their class and smash Mr. Hearst and other blood-suckling leeches. But the newsboy must help himself—Organize, Boys, Organize.

You say we are not hurting Hearst in the boycott because advertisements pay for the paper. Well, little newsboy, we know that the newspaper which gets the largest circulation also gets the largest paid advertisement. That is why newspapers have a Circulation Department generally used to increase and speed-up the circulation, using all tricks, even writing to a small rank and file paper, such as the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

Waterfront Worker and signing it "A Call-Bulletin Newsboy". There is nothing a Circulation Department will not do to boost "their" paper, regardless of how finky it is.

In closing we make an appeal to all workers to continue and spread the boycott against all yellow-lying sheets, especially the vicious red-baiting Hearst gutter-press.

Workers, read the Working class press — The Western Worker printed twice weekly and the Daily Worker, the only working-class daily in America.

We remain very respectfully yours,

The Editors
Waterfront Worker
P. O. Box 1158

Page 6 Waterfront Worker November 19, 1934

(Cartoon)

The Waterfront Worker Is Published by a Group of Rank and File Stevedores—Members of the I.L.A. - - - - -

Send All News . . . . . Articles and Donations to P. O Box 1158 . . . .

San Francisco, Cal. . . .

FINNEGAN SIGNS HIS NAME AGAIN
CLERKS BEWARE

Dear Ed:

You dont have to call a clerk Oscar to make him wild these days. Just ask him how he likes the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

award that Finnegan got for him from the arbitration board. The only ones the clerks have a right to get mad at though are themselves. This paper warned them months ago, that no union should give one man the power to act for it in negotions, let alone a man like Finnegan, whose knowledge of the labor movement is nil. But the clerks have run their union like a bunch of boy scouts with Finnegan, the Leader the Noonan, the Scout Master, Brolan and Hesketh, the Chief Cubs. These boys went around the docks saying the board was leaning over backwards in the clerk's favor. Well, this kind of Favor has given many clerks a reduction in wages. The whole award is finky. President Roosevelt and Bill Green have both come out strong for a shorter working day and yet the board deliberately ignored that side of the question, despite the fact that there are, on the busiest days, clerks out of a job. How "Limo Johnstone" on 26 will laugh now that the board has authorized all docks to put his system of one hour shifts, into operation.

Why clerks, who are supposed to have more brains than us stevies, should allow themselves to be flim-flammed for a whole year is a mystery!

Does Finnegan have you fellows hypnotized or chloroformed? Why you should think this guy, who couldn't make good as a shyster lawyer, would make a union leader, is another mystery. He was wrong on the June 16th signing. He was wrong

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

on the14th Street notice, when he said it was a fair shop with fink clerks working there. He was not there when we wanted to clean out the finks from 26. But why go on? Next time, get a man who will do as You tell him and not try to tell you what is best for you Start in now and fight that fink award because the board leaned so far backward that they have fallen on their rumps and you are underneath. Get a rank and file committee to get you out of the wilderness where your "Leader" has lost you.

A Longshoreman.

(Cartoon)

Man—"Did you do your good turn today?"

Three Scouts—"Yes Finnie! We put over the award."

MR. ABEL KNOWS — OH YEAH!!

Dear Ed:

Oakland 14th St. is in the limelight again. Mr. Abel, the big boss there, has been giving out weight to the newspapers since last week's little disturbance, says, "The I.L.A. is not going to tell him, etc. etc." Also, "The I.L.A. has no jurisdiction over clerks". Mr. Abel may be able to kid himself that way, but will he be able to persuade the Labor men of Oakland, that members of the punk orchestra run by his straw boss, are able to come to work the morning after and do the work that I.L.A. clerks are qualified and able to do?

Oakland Stevedore.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 286—(Continued)

FOR SALE: CHEAP—

Used shower bath equipment, only slightly used during strike by scabs. Apply Syd Alvin, Pier 18

[Endorsed]: Filed June 2, 1942.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, I believe you testified—when did you say the ILA was organized? [5940]

A. June, 1933.

Q. And who obtained the charter for the ILA at that time?

A. The organizer at that time, Lee J. Holman.

Q. Were you an organizer at that time of the ILA? A. It depends on what you mean.

Q. Well, did you go about trying to get members? A. Yes.

Q. To make up this new union? A. Yes.

Q. Were you one of the charter members?

A. No.

Q. Do you know who the charter members were, how many there were? A. Oh, about 10 or 12.

Presiding Inspector: Haven't you been all over this?

Mr. Del Guercio: No, we haven't.

Presiding Inspector: I thought he said he wasn't a charter member although he was an original member.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Were you an original member of the ILA?

A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes. [5941]

Presiding Inspector: A charter member, I suppose, is one who asks for the charter.

The Witness: I was initiated in June, 1933 and the organization was chartered in 1933.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was it chartered before you were initiated into the union? A. Of course. That's logical.

Q. So that you were not one of the original founders of the ILA?

A. In the way of being a charter member? Signing for the charter?

Q. In any way?

A. No. Most of the charter members were not even longshoremen.

Q. Was Holman a longshoreman?

A. Some time past, but he had never been on the waterfront for 10 years.

Q. Were you a paid official of the ILA at any time from its inception to the time of the calling of the 1934 strike? A. At no time.

Q. Who was the President of the Union at that time? A. Lee J. Holman.

Q. Prior to the 1934 strike?

A. Before the 1934 strike? [5942]

Q. Yes. A. Lee J. Holman.

Q. Lee J. Holman? A. Yes, sir.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Now, the calling of the 1934 strike was discussed prior to May 9, 1934, in the union, was it not?

A. Oh, it was originally set for March 7, 1934.

Q. And who had advocated it? Did Holman advocate calling the strike?

A. No. He was against it.

Q. And who advocated it?

A. Lots of us did. I did.

Q. Would you say that you were instrumental in having the union, the ILA, go on record as favoring a strike at that time? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Very definitely, yes.

Q. Would you say that anybody else was responsible?

A. Certainly. Many others were responsible. It wasn't a one-man job. The strike was voted by a referendum.

Q. And I believe there is testimony here that a Strike Committee of the Local Union was created or formed. [5943] A. It was.

Q. At whose suggestion was that Strike Committee formed?

A. Well, I don't know if you would say that it was on my sole suggestion, but I know at least I, among others, suggested it, and very strenuously.

Q. Did Holman oppose it? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. And a vote was taken, as I understand it, in the Local Union and a Strike Committee was formed and persons were nominated?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Not that way, no.

Q. How was it done?

A. A strike Committee was established of 75 men.

Q. Who established it?

A. Composed of two men from each dock elected in the union meeting.

Q. Were you elected in a union meeting?

A. Yes, elected from my particular dock on the Strike Committee.

Q. Was that a union matter or was it just an action of various individuals of the union?

A. That was a matter of the union meeting three months before the strike,—two months before the strike. [5944]

Q. Done in a regularly conducted union meeting?

A. Right, at Eagle's Hall. I have got the minutes of the meeting.

Q. Was Heiner a member of the original committee? A. Yes.

Q. Strike Committee?

A. Yes. He was elected from the dock, the same as I was.

Q. Did Holman appoint anyone on the Strike Committee? A. Holman?

Q. Yes. A. No.

Q. Did he suggest or propose anyone to serve on the Strike Committee?

A. You mean nominated anyone?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Yes. He might have. All he could do was to get up and place somebody's name in nomination.

Q. Did he oppose your nomination for the Strike Committee?

A. I don't think—as a matter of fact, I believe those last couple of months before the strike Holman had quietly disappeared.

Q. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the time the Strike Committee was formed.

A. Yes. I am just wondering if he was even around. I [5945] think he disappeared at that time, or said he was sick or something. I don't have a distinct recollection that Holman was present at that meeting.

Q. What other paid officials of the ILA were there at that time? A. Of the Locals?

Q. Yes.

A. The Treasurer, the Vice-President.

Q. Who was the Vice-President?

A. A fellow by the name of Joe Johnson.

Q. Did he participate?

A. I am pretty sure he did. He was pretty active at that time.

Q. Was he in favor of the strike?

A. I can't recollect whether he was or not. I have got an impression that he was, but I am not quite sure.

Q. Who was the Secretary?

A. Ivan F. Cox.

Q. Prior to the call of the strike did the Strike

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Committee operate under any directions from the President of the Local?

A. No. The Strike Committee was almost a separate body. We had quite a discussion over that with the officials taking the position that all the Strike Committee was for was to handle the strike and had no interest and no concern in any [5946] other business or any other affair of the Local itself.

Q. Was there any provision in the constitution of the ILA at that time regarding the relationship of the Strike Committee so formed and the officials of that Local?

A. No, I don't think there was. The constitution was pretty vague on those points and pretty incomplete.

Q. Well, could the Strike Committee under the Constitution as it then existed operate independent of the officials of the Union?

A. It could and did.

Q. Do you have the constitution of the ILA at that time? A. Have I?

Q. Yes.

A. I am not sure. I might be able to find out. I'll try, but if I recall——

Q. (Interposing) Will you try and——

A. (Interposing) Our constitution was very vague. We never did—it wasn't until many months after the strike, if I remember correctly, that we ever had a printed constitution of the Union.

Q. Now, you say you were a delegate to the San

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Francisco Labor Council that was set up during the 1934 strike? A. What was set up?

Q. Well, not the San Francisco Labor Council, but you [5947] were a delegate to the San Francisco Labor Council during the 1934 strike or a portion of it? A. And before the 1934 strike.

Q. And before? A. Yes.

Q. Now, what were some of the duties and purposes of the Labor Council?

A. The Labor Council? What were its duties and purposes?

Q. Yes.

A. Generally to act as an organizing medium for the entire labor movement; to act as a legislative body for the entire labor movement; to act in many cases and disputes as a body in attempting to negotiate a settlement of a dispute as a body for mediation, as a body that suggested or actually carried on arbitration; also as a central body that could—where the unions would congregate; a delegated body for the purposes of cooperating with each other, coordinating the various activities of each individual union and supporting each other.

Q. Well now, were their decisions binding upon the unions? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No, unless they could enforce them in some way. [5948]

Q. What?

A. Certain decisions they could enforce in more

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ways than one, but to say that all their decisions were binding on the unions, no, that is not so.

Q. Would they be binding on the Strike Committee during the time of the strike?

A. No, not particularly. The union could—a local Strike Committee could approve the recommendations. All the Council could do would be to recommend. If the Local Union to which the recommendation was directed or at which the recommendation was directed, if they wished to approve the recommendation, all right. If they wished to reject it, the Labor Council could do nothing.

Q. Do you recall a mass meeting being held on June 19, 1934 in which the Marine Workers Industrial Union's representative Harry Jackson spoke?

A. You mean at the Civic Auditorium?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

Q. Who called that meeting? A. Oh, sure.

Q. Who called it?

A. I think the Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. Were you a member of the Joint Marine Strike Committee?

A. What was the date of the meeting? [5949]

Q. June 19, 1934.

A. The Joint Marine Strike Committee called it, yes, and I was the Chairman of the Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. And who invited Harry Jackson to come over to speak?

A. I don't know. The Committee, I guess. All arrangements for the meeting were approved by

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the Committee. The way those meetings were arranged, they would be arranged through a sub-committee who would report back to the main committee and they would approve all arrangements. If Jackson was invited——

Q. (Interposing) Did the Marine Workers Industrial Union have a representative on the Strike Committee?

A. They had a speaker as a union on strike, and I remember a big fuss was made of it.

Q. Well, did they have a representative on the Joint Strike Committee?

A. No, not after the first two or three days.

Presiding Inspector: I think you have been over that a good many times.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: That is pretty clear in the record.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't believe so.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

Mr. Del Guercio: If we have, I won't——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Well, that parti- [5950] cular feature, I am sure has been covered by the testimony. Not that meeting that I know of, but the representative of the Marine Workers Industrial Union on the General Strike Committee.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. As a matter of fact, the Marine Workers Industrial Union had withdrawn from membership

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

from the Joint Strike Committee at that time, had it not? A. Right.

Q. And at whose—were they requested to withdraw because of some action taken by some body?

A. Yes. Their seating on the Joint Strike Committee was protested by some of the Seamen's Unions and it developed into such a wrangle that the delegation from the Marine Workers Industrial Union finally got up and said "Well, sooner than have all this trouble and dissention on the Strike Committee as to whether we will be seated or not, we will pull out of the Strike Committee and keep on supporting the strike in every way we can".

Q. Then there was a question of the Marine Workers Industrial Union being seated in this Joint Strike Committee?

A. This was challenged by two or three groups; all the seamen's groups, I know.

Q. Just stick to that. Did you advocate that the Marine Workers Industrial Union representatives be seated on the Joint Strike Committee? [5951]

A. Yes.

Q. And the Joint Strike Committee voted not to seat them, is that correct?

A. That's right. I was under instructions from my Local Union to fight to seat them on the Committee as a striking union.

Q. That what? A. As a striking union.

Mr. Del Guercio: Will you read the last answer, please?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(The answer referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Who from the union gave you those instructions?

A. Well, first the Strike Committee and then all actions of the Strike Committee were approved by the general membership.

Q. Now, the Strike Committee was not the union, was it?

A. Oh, very much so in many respects at that time. In between meetings of the union the Strike Committee was the union.

Q. And you were the Strike Committee?

A. I was the Chairman of the Strike Committee, bound by its decisions and always carried them out.

[5952]

Q. All right. Now, after they had been refused a seat in this Joint Strike Committee they had no longer any official connection with the strike, did they, the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. As far as the Strike Committee—as far as being seated on the Strike Committee is concerned, that's right.

Q. And——

A. (Interposing) But they were still on strike.

Q. And thereafter you invited, as I understand it, Harry Jackson to speak at a mass meeting held at the Civic Auditorium?

A. They were officially invited to speak at that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

meeting and they did speak and the invitation came from the Joint Strike Committee.

Q. Who extended that invitation?

A. The Committee.

Q. Were you on the Committee?

A. Yes; Chairman.

Q. And did you advocate sending the invitation to Harry Jackson to appear to speak?

A. I don't recall specifically that I did, but I would, I think.

Q. You wouldn't have opposed it?

A. I don't think so.

Q. And did Harry Jackson at that time advocate a [5953] general strike?

A. I'm not sure. He might have. I only remember one specific remark that he made that stuck in my head ever since.

Q. And thereafter did not the San Francisco Labor Council pass a resolution on June 22, 1934 substantially to the effect that the Labor Council disclaimed all connection with Communist organizations and particularly the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. That's right.

Q. And did not in the same resolution the San Francisco Labor Council advise the Longshoremen's Association, the ILA, to disavow all connections with the Communist element on the waterfront?

A. Yes.

Q. Huh?

A. A resolution was passed. I remember a big battle in the Labor Council the night it was passed.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And did you consider yourself bound by such a resolution?

A. Yes. I think at that time—we approved the passage of the resolution at the local meeting.

Q. Did you approve it? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes. [5954]

Q. Did you disavow your connections with the Communist Party after the passage of that resolution?

A. I followed the orders of my union.

Q. Huh?

A. And that's what happened.

Q. Huh? A. I can tell you why.

Q. Well, now, didn't you continue cooperating with the Marine Workers Industrial Union even after the passage of that resolution? A. No.

Q. Didn't you continue to advise with and associate with Harry Jackson? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. I never said I did. I have already testified that later on they had to have their own set-up entirely. Our members picketed with them, but after the passage of that resolution we had to take an official position for the simple reason that the Labor Council, along with the resolution, said "If you didn't you would get no more funds".

Q. As a matter of fact, you notified the Communist Party even before the resolution was passed to the effect that that action was going to be taken by the San Francisco Labor Council? [5955]

A. That is true.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Huh? A. That is true.

Q. And whom did you inform in the Communist Party?

A. I think I informed Darcy at the time.

Q. Sam Darcy? A. Yes.

Q. Where did you meet Sam Darcy to notify him of that resolution that was about to be passed?

A. Sam Darcy was down at our union headquarters very early in the strike. My best recollection is that he came down with Ross in connection with offering the printing of the special bulletin of the Waterfront Worker.

Q. Are you sure you didn't go to see Sam Darcy?

A. I am sure of it.

Q. You say that he and Lawrence Ross came down to you at your Union headquarters?

A. Yes, him and Lawrence Ross and some other person.

Q. When did they come down there?

A. Oh, that was shortly after the strike broke out.

Q. Well, the strike broke out in May?

A. Yes.

Q. And this action of the Labor Council, when was it first brought out that they were going to take such action? [5956]

A. Oh, the question came up two or three times in the Labor Council. I can give you the whole story. But there were certain—some of the officers in the Labor Council were for us and wanted to support us.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What do you mean? For whom?

A. For the longshoremen, for the strike and in support of us. Others were definitely against us. Others even tried to stop the chartering of our Local Union.

Q. Let's stick to Sam Darcy.

A. The whole story is tied in together.

Q. You met Sam Darcy when with reference to the matter of the resolution that was passed by the San Francisco Labor Council?

A. Oh, it was before that.

Q. How long before it?

A. I first remember meeting Sam Darcy in the early days of the strike on the occasion that I have told you about.

Q. Is that the only time you met him?

A. Oh, no. I met him later.

Q. The first time you met him did you discuss with him the action that the District Council was contemplating taking with regard to the disavowing connection with the Communist Party of the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. No, not that I recall. The discussion all centered around the one thing and I don't know as any action was contem- [5957] plated at that time.

Q. The second time you met Sam Darcy was when? A. Oh, I don't know.

Q. Huh?

A. I met him on more than one occasion during that entire strike period. I couldn't say the second time I met him.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. How many times did you meet Sam Darcy during the 1934 strike?

A. Oh, I don't know that.

Q. Huh? A. I don't know that.

Presiding Inspector: I think we will stop here and resume at two o'clock.

(Whereupon at 12:35 o'clock P. M. a recess was taken until 2:00 o'clock P. M. of the same day.) [5958]

After Recess
2:00 O'Clock P. M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio.

By the way, there is a letter from Mr. Meyer saying that there are no other statutes or regulations. I will show you the letter. Hand it to Mr. Gladstein.

(The letter referred to was passed to Mr. Gladstein.)

Mr. Grossman: This probably should be marked for identification, then, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Grossman: Since the other was.

Mr. Del Guercio: I haven't seen it.

Mr. Grossman: Oh, I beg your pardon.

(The letter referred to was passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Mark it for identification.

Mr. Del Guercio: Very well.

Presiding Inspector: Just in connection with the other letter.

(The letter referred to was marked for identification as Alien's Exhibit No. 40.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Del Guercio.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Cross Examination (Resumed) [5959]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, during the general strike in 1934 did your Strike Committee or the Strike Committee of which you were Chairman continue to exist?

A. Yes.

Q. Did your Strike Committee thereafter have full control of the general strike? A. No.

Q. Who did?

A. The General Strike Committee.

Q. And who formed the General Strike Committee?

A. The San Francisco Labor Council.

Q. Were you on that Committee? A. Yes.

Q. What was your position on that Committee.

A. I was a delegate to it, and later on a member of the General Executive Strike Committee.

Q. Was there also a Strike Strategy Committee?

A. Yes, prior to that.

Q. What? A. Prior to that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. And who formed the Strike Strategy Committee?

A. Formed by the Labor Council.

Q. Were you on it? A. No. [5960]

Q. And what were the functions or duties of the Strike Committee—of the Strategy Committee?

A. It was a Committee of Seven appointed by the San Francisco Labor Council to see what steps could be taken by the Labor Council to terminate the dispute, or the strike in our favor.

Q. Would it be true to say that through this Strategy Committee and the other Committee of which you spoke that the leadership of the general strike was placed in the hands of conservative leaders of the AF of L?

A. Not necessarily. There was a lot of leaders on there that you might not term conservative; some of them you would definitely.

Q. Now, and what did this Committee do with reference to the general strike?

A. What committee?

Q. The Strategy Committee.

A. The Strategy Committee?

Q. Yes.

A. The main thing it done was to try to prevent the general strike.

Q. It didn't succeed? A. No.

Q. Now, did you oppose a general strike?

A. No; I was for it. [5961]

Q. You were for it? A. Yes.

Q. Was the Communist Party for a general strike. A. I think it was.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was the Marine Workers Industrial Union for a general strike?

A. All the unions that went on general strike were for it.

Q. Was the Marine Workers Industrial Union for it?

A. I think so; yes. All the maritime unions were.

Q. Would you say the conservative element in the unions were against the general strike?

A. What do you mean by "element"?

Q. Conservative elements, the AF of L leaders in the various unions, and particularly the Strike Strategy Committee?

A. That is pretty hard—I don't know exactly what you mean. There were certain individuals and certain unions opposed to a general strike; certain unions for it. The latter were in the majority.

Q. Now, did you hold any conferences with members of the Communist Party just prior to the calling of the general strike? A. No.

Q. Did you meet with Sam Darcy?

A. No—in connection with the calling of the general [5963] strike?

Q. Yes.

A. Not that I remember; no.

Q. Well, will you try and remember?

A. I can—the answer is still "No".

Q. Did you meet with Harry Jackson?

A. No.

Q. Did you discuss with him the calling of the general strike?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I have explained how I met with Harry Jackson. I couldn't avoid meeting with Jackson in connection with the activities of his men on strike, and his union practically during the strike period.

Q. You said that you met with Sam Darcy on numerous occasions during the general strike, is that correct?

A. Did I say that? I said that I had quite a few meeting with Darcy. I don't know how many.

Q. Would you say you had 25 meetings with Sam Darcy during that period? A. No.

Q. Would you say you had 20? A. No.

Q. How many?

Mr. Grossman: During what period?

The Witness: The general strike period, as I understood it. [5963]

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. A. No.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. How many? A. Two or three.

Q. Where did you have these meetings with Sam Darcy?

A. Generally on the waterfront, or in union headquarters.

Q. The ones you had in the union headquarters, who would be present?

A. Oh, it might be myself, and other members of the Strike Committee.

Q. Who, on the Strike Committee—all the members?

A. Anybody that happened to be around; not all the members necessarily.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Can you fix any particular meeting with Sam Darcy that you can remember?

A. No, I can't.

Q. During the general strike? A. No.

Q. Was Sam Darcy a member of any union?

A. No. I think when we met with him we met with him as a representative of the Communist Party——

Q. Now——

A. (Interposing): ——or of the Western Workers. [5964]

Q. When "we met with him." By that you mean you and certain others?

A. I and others.

Q. What did you discuss with Sam Darcy?

A. That depends. I don't recall that. I can recall two or three particular matters we discussed with him, but to recall all the things we ever discussed would be impossible.

Q. Let us have the things you do recall discussing with Sam Darcy.

A. I recall specifically discussing with him in regard to the Western Worker. I recall specifically——

Q. (Interposing): What was the discussion regarding the Western Worker that you had with Sam Darcy?

A. I think I told you once what that was: that they came down and offered to print a bulletin for us with the Western Worker apparatus and it was accepted. That is one thing I recall.

I can recall very distinctly discussing a meeting

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

with Sam Darcy in connection with a lot of people that were injured around the end of May, in 1934.

I can recall distinctly meeting with Sam Darcy in connection with the action taken by the Labor Council and by my own union—that we had to disassociate ourselves officially and publicly from any connection with the Communist Party.

Q. Was that after the resolution had been passed by the San Francisco Labor Council or before?

A. I don't know whether it was after or before. I think it was possibly after.

I recall those [5965]

Q. Was that after the resolution had been passed by the San Francisco Labor Council or before?

A. I don't know whether it was after or before. I think it was possibly after.

Q. How many times did you see Sam Darcy after this resolution had been passed?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't know. A few times.

Q. So many times that you couldn't fix them?

A. No. No, no. You are talking about the strike period now?

Q. Yes.

A. You are talking about the strike period?

Q. After the resolution had been passed by the San Francisco Labor Council in June, 1934.

A. I don't know, two or three or four times, maybe.

Q. And where did you meet Sam Darcy then?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Generally on the waterfront, or somewhere thereabouts.

Q. What did you talk about with Sam Darcy?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't know.

Q. And who were present when you met Sam Darcy? [5966]

A. I don't recall that. They would be members of the union or the Strike Committee.

Q. Was Schmidt there?

A. It's possible.

Q. What?

A. It's possible. It was done openly, nothing secret about it.

Q. Huh? A. Nothing secret about it.

Q. When was the general strike called? I don't believe we have that fixed in the record.

A. July 16 to the 20th, '34.

Q. July 16th to the 20th?

A. That's right.

Q. Was there any discussion in the General Strike Committee as to whether the Bakery Wagon Drivers and the Milk Wagon Drivers and the Ice Wagon Drivers were to go out? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. And what was your stand on that proposition?

A. Against it. As a matter of fact, when we first proposed the general strike program we took care of all those things in the proposals.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Well, didn't you before the General Strike Committee claim that allowing the Bakery Wagon Drivers and the Milk Wagon [5967] Drivers and the Ice Wagon Drivers to remain at work would be bad strategy and it might break up the strike?

A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. Exactly the opposite. I am sure we can find it in the minutes.

Q. Now, do you have the minutes of the general Strike Committee?

A. No, but I have got an idea I can find out where we can get them.

Q. Are they available to you?

A. No. They are not available to me, but I believe the minutes of the General Strike Committee at that time are laying around somewhere and I could ask certain officials of that Committee for them. They might be available.

Q. Who was President of the San Francisco Central Labor Council at that time?

A. Edward Vandeleur.

Q. Now, if Vandeleur would say that your stand was opposite to what you are testifying now would your testimony be the same?

A. Sure. Vandeleur has been mistaken more than once.

Q. Will you make an effort to obtain the minutes of that General Strike Committee with reference to that matter?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I will be glad to. You could do a much better job [5968] in that connection than I could, possibly. I could give you the names of the people who are officials and who I think have those minutes.

Q. Yes, do that.

A. Yes, I am pretty sure if you approach Mr. Vandeleur, Mr. John O'Connell of the Labor Council or Mr. George Kidwell, who was Secretary of the Strike Committee, and request them on behalf of the FBI that they will be forthcoming.

Q. When did the 1934 strike end?

A. What strike?

Q. The 1934 strike.

A. What part of it? It had two or three different groups in it at different times.

Q. The part that you were connected with, the longshoremen. I assume you were connected with the longshoremen.

A. The longshoremen's strike ended July 31st.

Q. July 31, 1934? A. Yes.

Q. Did the Marine Workers Industrial Union go back to work on that day, too?

A. Yes. All Marine groups did.

Q. And did the strike end for all purposes on July 31, 1934?

A. Oh, no. No, no. It carried on in many ways.

Q. What continued? [5969]

A. Well, the clearing of many of the strike breakers off the waterfront continued; the organizational work continued; the adjustment of the va-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

rious grievances continued and the discrimination against union men continued.

Presiding Inspector: I think by the "strike" itself he meant the men not being at work.

The Witness: That's right.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That ended on July 31st?

A. That ended the main strike, yes. But there were post-strike activities that went on and actions.

Presiding Inspector: Almost always that is the case?

The Witness: Yes. There were walk-outs and stoppages of work over disputes and discrimination for many, many months.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Were you in favor of the men going back to work on July 31, 1934?

A. Very definitely. I advocate the support of arbitration and the men returned to work all together. That's when the so-called conservative leaders got pretty militant and it went the other way.

Q. You weren't in that conservative group, were you?

A. No. I was against them. I was for getting back to work. [5970]

Q. You were in the 1934 strike with the Communist Party and with the Marine Workers Industrial Union? You were on their side, were you not?

A. I had done what?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Were you on the side of the Communist Party and the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I was on the side of the people on strike.

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, may I have Government's Exhibit 135?

(The exhibit referred to was passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you here Government's Exhibit 135 entitled "From Bryan to Stalin" by Foster. You know who Foster is, don't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is he?

A. Bill Foster, an old trade unionist and I think he is now the official head of the Communist Party.

Q. Have you read his book, Government's Exhibit 135? A. Yes.

Q. You know that it carries on account of the 1934 strike? A. That's why I read it, mainly.

Q. Now, I refer you particularly to that portion of it beginning on page 258 and ending here on the middle of page [5971] 262. Would you say that that was a correct exposition of the events as they occurred during the 1934 strike?

A. (Reading pages enumerated) Generally I think that's correct. Uh huh, (affirmative.).

Q. Now, can you point out anything that is incorrect?

A. I can go over this paragraph by paragraph —starting with the San Francisco strike, starting off on page 259, the second paragraph:

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"The most important strikes of 1934 were those in Toledo, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, the Pacific Coast Marine Strike, the San Francisco General Strike and the National Textile Strike. These were practically all conducted under the banner of the A F of L. For the most part, the TUUL's participation in them took the form of active support by its unions or work through its groups within the A F of L. But in all these situations the C.P. and the TUUL forces played a vital role."

Q. Is there anything wrong with that?

A. Not a great deal.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Anything else?

A. I can go over the whole thing. As I say, generally, the statements made in here are correct. It deals with the——

Q. (Interposing) Is this statement correct:

[5972]

"But it was in the big Pacific Coast Marine and San Francisco General Strike that the C.P. and the TUUL did their most important strike work in this period."

Is that correct?

A. I think if you will read——

Q. (Interposing) Is that statement correct?

A. It also says—I think it is correct—I think it points out that the Marine Workers Industrial Union organized the seamen and——

Q. (Continuing):

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"In fact, in this struggle"—referring to the San Francisco strike—"their influence was decisive."

That is the influence of the Communist Party and the TUUL A. Decisive in what way?

Q. You read the article haven't you?

A. Well, I have read it and I have my ideas on it. You have got to explain what you mean by being "decisive." They were very decisive.

Q. As far as it goes, is that correct?

A. Yes, as far as it goes—decisive in getting the Marine Workers on strike, sure.

Q. And this statement appearing on page 260:

"The strike movement began among the longshoremen early in the spring of 1934. The San Francisco local had taken [5973] the lead in lining up the weak ILA Coast Locals to present demands to the employers."

Is that statement correct? A. Correct.

Q. (Continuing):

"The employers, aided by corrupt ILA top leaders, tried the usual schemes of delay, conciliation and arbitration to break up the rapidly developing militant movement."

Is that correct? A. Correct.

Q. (Continuing):

"Rechecking these maneuvers, the ILA locals declared a strike on May 9th and had the whole Pacific Coast tied up within two days."

Is that correct?

A. Yes. They are brief statements. There are a lot of statements, but they are correct basically.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Continuing):

"Harry Bridges was elected Chairman of the ILA Strike Committee, and the Western Worker, Local Communist organ, was endorsed as the official strike journal."

Is that correct?

A. In the way I have described it; yes.

Q. Is it correct in the way Foster has described it, as I just read it to you? [5974]

A. Well——

Presiding Inspector: He doesn't describe it. He just makes the statement.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. In the statement that Foster made correct?

Presiding Inspector: I think he has answered that. He said "Yes", he described it.

If you want to press him further on it you may, if you think it will do any good.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, did the Strike Committee of which you were Chairman cease to exist after the men returned to work in July, or July 31, 1934?

A. Yes; very shortly afterward.

Q. Well, now, did you immediately after that, have any official position at all in the ILA Union?

A. I—right after the strike ended—I and two or three others carried on, on behalf of the unions, on a committee mainly concerned with settling grievances that carried over and making adjustments of complaints after the strike was over.

Q. I believe your first position in the, official

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

position in the ILA local 38-79 was President, is that correct?

A. No. I was an Executive Committee member.

Q. For what period of time? [5975]

A. From '33 to '34.

Q. September 1933 to 1934—was that a paid position? A. No.

Q. You were elected President when?

A. September '34.

Q. Are you sure it was September, or was it October, 1934?

A. Well, at the time of the yearly elections—I thought it might have been later.

Q. That is the first time you held a paid position in the local?

A. No. I was paid on this position after the strike ended, that I have just referred to.

Q. On the Executive Board?

A. No. I was still a member of the Executive Board, but this was a position as kind of a trouble shooter.

Q. For how long a period did you hold that position?

A. Up until the time I was President.

Q. And for how long previously?

A. What is that?

Q. For how long previous thereto?

A. From the end of the strike.

Presiding Inspector: About a year?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

The Witness: No, no. From July to September, as I understood the question. [5976]

Presiding Inspector: When were you elected President—wasn't that the next year?

The Witness: No; the same year—the fall of 1934, September or October.

Presiding Inspector: I misunderstood.

The Witness: I thought it was September.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And when you were elected President, in either September or October, 1934, you became a paid official of the Union, that is, a permanently paid position?

A. Yes; but I was being paid before that time.

Presiding Inspector: From the end of the strike?

The Witness: From the end of the strike up until the time I was regularly elected President. I was paid as a kind of a representative of the Union, adjusting matters that came up after the strike, that was a carry-over.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And you have been a paid official ever since, up to the present time, ever since the end of the 1934 strike? A. Not continuously.

Q. Huh? A. Not continuously.

Q. You have been an official of the Union ever since?

A. I have been an official of the Union, but I [5977] haven't been paid continuously.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Have you done any longshore work?

A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Any work, manual work of any kind that you got paid for?

A. No—I have done a lot of work.

Q. You have lived off the union ever since that?

A. That is not a correct statement. I have lived off of nobody at no time.

Q. The union has paid you, however, since that time, has it not— that is where your salary came from?

Presiding Inspector: He said——

A. (Interposing) The union has paid me, and has offered to pay me more, and I have refused it.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you continue to be a delegate on the San Francisco Labor Council after the 1934 Strike?

A. Yes.

Q. For how long a period?

A. Until we were thrown out of there.

Q. When were you thrown out? A. 1937.

Q. By whom? [5978]

A. The Labor Council.

Q. That is, after your union went CIO?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, during the time that you—in what capacity did you serve on the San Francisco Labor Council after the 1934 strike?

A. I was never any more than a delegate. For a

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

brief time I was elected to the Executive Committee, but I never had enough time to show up at the meetings and I resigned.

Q. You resigned before you were thrown out?

A. Oh, yes. I think that was around 1936 some time.

Q. Now, how often would the San Francisco Labor Council hold meetings?

A. Every Friday night.

Q. Did you attend all those meetings until the time you resigned?

A. Every one, as long as I was in San Francisco. I never missed a meeting.

Q. Now, did you hold any meetings with anybody else prior to these Friday night meetings of the San Francisco Labor Council?

A. Occasionally we did at certain times; yes.

Q. With whom?

A. Well, we had a whole caucus of delegates that used to attend the Labor Council. [5979]

Q. Well, now would they be in connection with matters that were to be taken up in the Labor Council meeting the next day? A. That is right.

Q. Who would you sit with?

A. Who would we sit with?

Q. Yes.

A. The delegates, you mean?

Q. Yes—in these caucus meetings?

A. There was delegates from, as I remember, from the culinary group, delegates from the machinists groups, delegates from practically every mari-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

time union, delegates from the clothing workers—they were there—and we had a group of about, oh, 20 or 30. [5980]

Q. Twenty or thirty?

A. Delegates, more or less.

Q. How many were there on the Labor Council all together?

A. How many delegates used to attend the Labor Council?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, I think around 250 or 300.

Q. Did this group that you speak of, of 20 or 30——

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing): ——would they meet regularly?

A. The year round? No. Generally before elections.

Q. Can you give me the names of some of those that met with you prior to the regular meetings of the San Francisco Labor Council?

A. You mean of our caucus?

Q. Yes. That is what you call it a, "caucus"?

A. Yes. Well now, maybe you are referring to something else.

Q. What?

Presiding Inspector: No. it is of the caucus. Go ahead.

A. Well, I could give you the names of quite a few. There might be repercussions in their own par-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ticular unions from their Internationals, but I guess it can't be helped. [5981]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Are you talking to yourself or are you testifying? A. No, I am explaining.

Presiding Inspector: Do you want him to give the names?

The Witness: I don't wish to give the names.

Presiding Inspector: He would rather not give the names. Do you want to press him on it?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: All right. Give the names.

The Witness: There used to be—we'll take, first of all, the delegates from the Cooks and Waiters. I think Battalini, who has just been elected to office——

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Interposing): Battalini?

A. Battalini.

Q. How do you spell it?

A. B-a-t-t-a-l-i-n-i, I think.

Q. Is that the same one that is connected with the American Peace Mobilization? A. Who?

Q. Is that the same person who is connected with the American Peace Mobilization?

A. I don't know. He might be. I am not sure.

Q. All right.

A. And I think McKelvie is another one. I don't know [5982] his first name. He was one of the strong supporters of the rank and file in the Labor Council. Another fellow from Local 110, also Culinary group. There was Sam Jaye, was one. There were others,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

but at least I recall Jaye. There were more from that particular group. I can't recall them offhand. From the Metal Trades—that is, Metal Trades groups—I remember a fellow named Saunders.

Q. What is Saunders' first name?

A. Hookendillan.

Q. What is Saunders' first name?

A. I don't know. I think Bill Saunders. Hookendillan, Slattery, Scheer. They were Metal Trades workers and others.

Q. How about Walter Lambert?

A. I don't know if he was there. He might have been there. I don't know if he represented any particular Union at that time.

Q. Would you say that he didn't attend any of these caucuses that you speak of?

A. I can't be sure. It is possible he did.

Q. Huh?

A. If he was representing a union—the caucus would be confined to representatives of unions in the Labor Council.

Q. Was Lambert representing any union at that time? A. He might have been, I don't know.

Q. Was he a delegate to the San Francisco Labor Council?

A. He might have been. I don't know. [5983]

Q. The minutes would show, would they not?

A. Yes. I think the minutes would. The Labor Council would have credentials at that time. I recall when I first met Lambert. I think he was a delegate

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

to the Labor Council, and I might be getting things mixed as to the exact time. He might have been there.

Q. Was Henry Schmidt?

A. Oh, yes. All of our delegates were there; all the maritime delegates.

Q. Schomaker?

A. Schomaker, sure. Our entire delegation used to attend.

Q. Where would you meet with this group?

A. I think some of the meetings we held of that were in Albion Hall.

Q. Were they open meetings?

A. No. I would say they were closed to the extent I have outlined. They were a private caucus.

Q. And what would you do in these meetings? Would you program?

A. We would program for the Labor Council what candidates we were going to support and why and so forth.

Q. Would the meetings be regular meetings. Would a Chairman be elected?

A. Yes, I think we had a Chairman to keep order.

Q. Did you preside as Chairman? [5984]

A. I don't recall that I ever did. They were not that formal.

Q. Did Walter Lambert?

A. Never as far as I remember, if he was there.

Q. Did Sam Darcy ever appear at any of these meetings?

A. I am sure Darcy never attended any of them?

Q. Harry Jackson?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No. I don't think Jackson would attend any of them or did.

Q. Are you sure that Harry Jackson never appeared before any of these caucuses?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. Now, you knew, then, did you not, at the time these meetings were going on that Walter Lambert was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Oh, I think so, yes. The time I am thinking of would be about 1934 and '35.

Q. That is the same time. A. Yes.

Q. And wasn't he the so-called trade union expert of the Communist Party? A. Who?

Q. Walter Lambert?

A. Yes; he was one of them.

Q. Do you know any others who were trade union experts in the Communist Party?

A. I guess they all believe or they all are in some form [5985] or other.

Q. And did Walter Lambert lay down in these meetings that you attended with him the Communist Party Line in regard to your trade union activities?

A. The meetings were all held on the question of a program for the Labor Council.

Q. Did Walter Lambert—did you understand my question?

A. Yes, I understood your question.

Q. Will you answer that first?

A. Well, I don't recall anything. All the meetings were concerned with what I have told you and I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

don't recall Lambert laying down any program, even if he was there. I don't recall him him specifically being there, not at the times I am thinking of.

Q. You did at the last hearing testify that Walter Lambert did attend such caucuses, did you not?

A. I might have.

Q. Huh? A. I might have.

Q. Let me refer to your testimony in the previous hearing in that connection. I refer now to page 2695, Volume 17:

"Q. (Interrupting) : Suppose I ask you a few names; would that relieve it? Was Lambert there?

"A. I think Lambert was there a couple of times."

A. Yes.

Q. Did you so testify? [5986]

A. I believe I did.

Q. At the last hearing?

A. I believe I did.

Q. And is that testimony true?

A. I think it is.

Q. Is there any question?

A. No, no question, except that I just don't remember two years later where I said that I think he was at a meeting. I still say I think he might have been there. I am telling you what I based it on. It would be very easy to check up. The Council group at that time running for elections put out their own printed slate with a full slate of candidates and we all stood at the door of the Council——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Interposing): Is this an answer to some question or are you just making a speech?

A. Well, at least I guess you want all the knowledge you can get on the subject.

Q. Wait until I ask the question first.

A. This was following up the question.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead and ask the next question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Well, as a matter of fact, while you were meeting with Walter Lambert in these caucuses you knew he wasn't a member of any union?

A. Not particularly. I knew nothing of the kind; no [5987] sir.

Q. You knew that the only union, called a "union", that he was representing, was the Communist Party? A. I did not.

Q. Huh? A. I did not.

Q. Well, do you have any information either now or then that Walter Lambert was representing any union while you were meeting with him in these meetings?

A. My distinct impression is that he is and was a member of the union. I have told you that.

Q. Of what union?

A. I don't know. I have told you you can check up on it, too. The credentials or the files of the Labor Council will show you that and they will give them to you before they will give them to me.

Q. Who arranged for these caucuses? Who brought it about?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Well, I know I arranged for some of them.

Q. Who started them?

A. I did in many respects.

Q. Was it your own suggestion or did somebody suggest it to you?

A. Mainly I was running for office in the Labor Council. I was running for office in the Labor Council and [5988] I was looking for a little support, and I started to organize some of it and that's how this come about.

Q. This continued over a period of years, did it?

A. Oh, no. I never said that.

Q. For how long a period?

A. My only recollection is '34 and '35.

Q. Well, that's two years. A. Yes.

Q. Approximately.

A. But I don't recall any year-round meetings. These meetings or caucuses used to start maybe a month or two before the regular elections. That's all that I have reference to. Any others I don't know them.

Q. Now, you have heard of the American League Against War and Fascism? A. Oh, yes.

Q. And you have heard the testimony that was given here regarding the American League Against War and Fascism? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Have you ever been a member of the American League Against War and Fascism? A. Never.

Q. Did you ever hold any position in the American League Against War and Fascism?

A. No.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you recall a Pacific Coast Congress Against War [5989] and Fascism in San Francisco on April 28, 1935? A. Where at?

Q. In San Francisco?

A. Not off-hand, I don't.

Q. Did you attend such a conference, such a congress?

A. I think I have attended a couple of conferences.

Q. Well, with particular reference to this Congress that was held in San Francisco on April 28, 1935 did you attend it?

A. I can't specifically place it. If you can tell me where it was I would know better. I attended numerous conferences and I have a——

Q. (Interposing): Maybe I can refresh your memory. You had just come back from Seattle, Washington. A. In April?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. We just came back after a convention up there.

Q. Now do you recall attending such a Congress?

A. I don't recall if I attended at that time, but I have a recollection of attending some conferences.

Q. Do you know Leo Gallagher?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is Leo Gallagher?

A. He's a member of a group of attorneys in Los [5990] Angeles, at the present time, the official firm of attorneys representing some of our unions and doing an excellent job of it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And an admitted Communist, isn't that correct? A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. Is he? I don't know.

Q. Has he ever denied that he was a member of the Communist Party? A. I can't recall.

Q. What?

A. I can't recall ever asking him.

Q. Huh?

A. We just don't run around nailing people down and asking them if they are Communists or not.

Q. Representing, you say, some of the CIO Unions in Los Angeles?

A. CIO Unions and ILWU Unions that I happen to be elected President of, and doing a good job of it.

Q. Huh? A. That's what I said.

Q. That's what you say.

A. That is what I said. Just freed two or three men that were on charges.

Q. And is he also the Los Angeles ILD attorney

A. I don't think he is.

Q. What? [599]]

A. I don't think he is.

Q. Was he ever an attorney for the ILD?

A. He possibly has been. I am not sure. I think he had handled cases for the ILD, but I believe his partner, Al Wirin, was the ILD attorney. Oh, no. That's wrong. I think Grover Johnson, another member of the firm, was the ILD attorney.

Q. And isn't that the same Leo Gallagher who

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

represented the Communists that were charged with setting fire to the Reischwehr in Germany?

A. Certainly. He certainly did. That's exactly what——

Q. (Interposing): Do you know who sent him over to Germany to represent such Communists?

A. Either the Communist Party or the ILD. Whoever done it I would certainly be in favor of it.

Q. Now, to go back to this Congress Against War and Fascism, isn't it true that you were elected to the presiding committee at that Congress Against War and Fascism held in San Francisco on April 28, 1935?

A. I don't know. I have no particular recollection. How was I attending? Was I attending as a delegate from our Local Union to such a Conference?

Q. Were you?

A. I have been elected to many committees attending a conference on behalf of my Local Union. Any time I was nominated and elected I would serve. That's what I was there for. [5992]

Q. Well, did you ever serve on such a presiding committee of the Congress Against War and Fascism?

A. I don't specifically remember it, but if you have got a record there that I did it's possibly true.

Q. If I showed you the record would you then admit that you did *service*?

A. I can see what's doing on it, then.

Q. Let me show you what——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(Whereupon the document referred to was passed to Mr. Gladstein)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have here the proceedings of the first Pacific Congress Against War and Fascism, San Francisco, California, Building Trade Temple, April 27 and 28, 1935. On the first page appears this:

"The following were elected to the presiding committee", and among others "Harry Bridges, President, San Francisco International Longshoremen's Association". Does that refresh your memory?

A. Yes, I think that's correct. I think that's correct. I believe that——

Q. (Interposing): You were elected on the presiding committee of this Congress of—what do they call it?

A. Of the West Coast, or the Pacific Coast Congress [5993] Against War and Fascism. But I am trying to find out what this thing was called by. Maybe it was called by us. It just shows that I was elected to a committee at a conference attended by probably half the trade unions in San Francisco.

Mr. Gladstein: Does it purport to be put out by the American League Against War and Fascism, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: It is headed "The Minutes and Proceedings of the First Pacific Coast Congress Against War and Fascism, April 28, 1935, San Francisco, California", signed by Thelma Bramley, Regional Secretary.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: That isn't the same as American League Against War and Fascism on its face.

Mr. Del Guercio: It is the forerunner.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know anything about that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now,——

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing): Just a moment! I would suggest this: If you are not offering that, there is quite a list of people on that presiding committee. I don't know what counsel's purpose is in questioning along this line, but I think for the sake of fairness that entire list should be put in and not simply Mr. Bridges' name taken out of the list, so that the character or nature of the committee, or whatever it was, may be before the eyes of the Court when it comes to judgment. [5994]

Presiding Inspector: You can put that in on redirect.

Mr. Gladstein: We don't have the book. It should be marked for identification at least, in view of the fact that it has been used.

Presiding Inspector: He will let you have the book.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have just shown it to refresh his recollection and it has served that purpose.

Presiding Inspector: And they may put in the rest of the paragraph if they want to put it in.

Mr. Gladstein: For that purpose I suggest that the document be marked for identification at this time. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes, there is at this time.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Your memory having been refreshed, do you recall attending such a Congress in San Francisco on April 28, 1935?

A. I don't recall attending that specific Conference. I attended so many. But I believe that record is correct and I don't remember any of the details.

Q. Well now, isn't it true that the Chairman of that Congress introduced you as President of the San Francisco ILA, who had just returned from Seattle, where you had been active in forming the Maritime Federation?

A. I don't remember it, but that's what the record said and that's entirely—possibly that is the way I would be [5995] introduced.

Q. And *is true* that you then reported on the work you accomplished at Seattle?

A. Yes. We are very proud of it.

Q. You recall that?

A. No, I don't. I am saying that this is the logical thing. I just returned from the first convention of the Maritime Federation and it is logical that I would report. And that book does something else. I was short a couple of dates around there in making up the New York trip. That fills in a couple of days that I was short. So if I had been able to know where I was at, if I had remembered that conference, I would have put that in my record.

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that that be stricken, if your Honor please, as not being responsive.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Well, it will come out afterwards. I think I will let it stand.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And at this conference were not the following pledges, among others, made: "To support the peace policies of the Soviet Union, including total and universal disarmament, and to defend the Soviet Union against all its enemies"?

A. Are you asking me?

Q. Was that pledge made?

A. Are you asking me from memory?

Q. Yes. [5996]

A. I don't know. I would sooner go by the record.

Q. I will show you the same proceedings here and call your attention to page 33.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, may I suggest that this is certainly improper, when the witness says that he can't remember whether he was at the conference (to ask him whether or not certain resolutions were passed?

Presiding Inspector: I think he has now conceded that he was at the conference.

Mr. Grossman: I don't think he has conceded that. He has conceded that he might have been there.

Presiding Inspector: He says that accounts for two days of his life.

Mr. Grossman: He says "if" he was there.

Presiding Inspector: Which I think is an admission that he was there.

Mr. Grossman: This is true: He might have been there, but he doesn't recall.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: He can say so. If this doesn't refresh his recollection, of course he is perfectly at liberty to say he doesn't remember.

The Witness: I am trying to say, if I was in attendance on that particular day. There is no question about the action was taken. That was one of the policies adopted by the conference according to the minutes here. [5997]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you subscribe to such a pledge?

A. I don't recall it, but if I was in attendance here, and that was the action taken by the conference, I would be part of it.

Q. And you would have made such a pledge, "to defend the Soviet Union against all enemies?"

A. Not necessarily. I mean—when you put it like that, not necessarily.

Q. Put it in the language, as used in this book, here, "to support the peace policies of the Soviet Union, including total and universal disarmament, and to defend the Soviet Union against all its enemies."

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): If your Honor please, to ask the witness whether he would have done something if he had been present—we have no objection to asking what his views are.

Presiding Inspector: It is purely hypothetical.

Mr. Grossman: I don't think he is entitled to ask such a hypothetical question.

Presiding Inspector: It is purely hypothetical. I don't think it is proper examination.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't see where that was even adopted. This seems to be a statement in a resolution put forward by somebody or other. I can't find where it was adopted. [5998]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Would you say it wasn't adopted?

A. Not that—I haven't found where it was adopted.

Q. Your office subscribed to the Western Worker about that time, did it not? A. My office?

Q. Yes.

A. April '35? I am not sure if it did or not.

Q. What?

A. It might have. I couldn't say for certain.

Q. Was your attention called to an article wherein your name appears in it——

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) Let me see it, please.

(The article referred to was passed to Mr. Grossman.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing) ——in the Western Worker for Thursday, May 2, 1935?

A. An article in the Western Worker by me?

Q. Wherein your name was mentioned as attending this Peace Conference?

A. Oh, I don't know. It is possible that there is such an article. You mean a statement in the newspaper that I attended?

Q. Yes.—A statement in the Western Worker.

[5999]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Well, I guess you might read that in every San Francisco newspaper. I can't keep track of every time my name is mentioned in the papers as doing this, that and the other thing.

Q. I will show you an article appearing in the Western Worker for Thursday, May 2, 1935, under the heading "238,000 unite in Pacific Coast Anti-War Meet," and I call your attention to the comments appearing on page 4 as follows:

"Harry Bridges spoke on the powerful Pacific Maritime Federation which has just been formed in Seattle, 35,000 strong, seamen, radio men, longshoremen, every one who works in the Marine Industry. Bridges told how this organization was fighting Fascism in the northeast, where a Fascist Committee of 500 openly advocates Fascist terrorism and the enactment of laws abolishing trades unions."

Does that refresh your memory?

A. On what?

Q. As to your——

A. (Interposing) As to whether——

Q. (Continuing): ——your presence at this Conference and your making these pledges, one of which I just read to you?

A. I think that I attended a conference—if it says so in the minutes there—and possibly you can go by the Western Worker, or you can take the other papers in San Francisco, the Chronicle or the Examiner. If you give me my choice [6000] on which I would believe I would sooner believe this.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. The Western Worker? A. Yes.

Q. The official organ of the Communist Party?

A. Before the Examiner, the Chronicle and the other papers; absolutely.

Presiding Inspector: May I see the document that you showed the witness? Have you finished with it for the moment?

Mr. Del Guercio: For the moment; yes.

(The booklet referred to was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May I proceed, or do you want to finish looking at that?

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did Sam Darcy appear and speak at the same Congress? A. I don't remember.

Q. Huh? A. I can't recall.

Q. Maybe this will refresh your memory—this is from the same article in the Western Worker, the article that I referred you to, and it states as follows:

"Sam Darcy, District Organizer of the Communist Party, sounded a grave note of warning. 'Unite, forget basic differences, join hands and defeat this relapse into barberism that [6001] is Fascism and the horrors of another world war!' His plea won the greatest ovation of the Congress. Darcy urged the consolidation of all liberal, radical and revolutionary political movements under a joint ticket in

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the coming elections, a Labor Party ticket for which all workers, poor farmers, middle-class and intellectual progressives may unite to elect their candidates."

Does that refresh your memory?

A. On what he said?

Q. Yes—and about Sam Darcy being there?

A. No, I don't recall him being there. I think the official minutes are the best thing to go by. As far as what he said. Apparently he knew what he was talking about, if you will look around us in this day.

Q. Would you believe the Western Worker?

A. I would sooner believe the minutes before I believe the Western Worker; and I would believe the Western Worker before the other papers.

Q. Was John Shoemaker also there?

A. I don't know.

Q. He was there from your union, wasn't he?

A. I don't know.

Q. Didn't he head the Trades Union Commission? A. I don't know.

Q. You would be interested in knowing whether he was there in an official capacity? [6002]

A. I am not saying he wasn't there. If there was such a conference going on we were attending as the official delegates, elected delegates of our union. If we weren't it can be checked up and found out. I will check the minutes and let you know.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. The Western Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party——

A. (Interposing) Right.

Q. (Continuing) ——states this in regard to Shoemaker:

"Delegate Shoemaker, of the ILA"——

That is your union?

A. That means he was a delegate there elected by the membership.

Q. (Continuing):

"* * * who headed the Trades Union Commission of the Congress"——.

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing):

"* * * told how the unions must be organized to defeat war and Fascism"——

A. (Interposing): That is right.

Q. Did he do that?

A. Well, I don't remember, but knowing Shoemaker I am pretty sure that he would. [6003]

Q. (Continuing):

"* * * told how the unions must be organized to defeat war and Fascism, with especial reference to tie-ups of munitions factories"——

You remember that, don't you?

A. I don't recall it.

Q. (Continuing):

"* * * transportation, food supplies and the handling of war materials during a general strike."

A. I don't recall that he said it, but a lot of people feel pretty strongly about these things.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you believe munitions should be tied up during times like the present, for instance?

A. And how! It depends on who they are going to. We have been opposing it.

Q. They are going to Great Britain.

A. That is news to me. I go down on the waterfront and see them going to Great Britain and everywhere else.

Q. Do you believe in tying up munitions, and war supplies, that the United States is now sending to Great Britain?

A. We haven't advocated any such thing. We have tied them up going to Japan, Italy and Germany.

Q. Do you believe in tying them up when going to Great Britain at the present time?

A. No, I don't think we have taken any position. [6004]

Q. What would be your position, or what is your position?

A. You mean as an individual, or as President of the Union?

Q. As a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well——

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment. I think that is improper. He hasn't admitted he is a member of the Communist Party. Let us keep within some bounds.

Mr. Del Guercio: He knows what I mean.

Presiding Inspector: But I don't. Go ahead.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Ask the next question. We are getting pretty far from the issue here involved.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you know if a Second Congress against War and Fascism was held in Chicago?

A. No.

Q. Do you know of a Congress against War and Fascism that was held in Chicago prior to the Congress held in San Francisco? A. No.

Q. Were you notified, or did you receive any information from any source to the effect that your name was placed before the Convention of the Second U. S. Congress against War and [6005] Fascism held at Chicago, Illinois, on September 28, 29, 30, in 1934? A. No.

Q. And that your name was placed before the Convention as a nominee for the Executive Committee? A. No.

Q. And that you were unanimously elected?

A. And I wasn't there?

Q. Were you there?

A. I am sure I wasn't.

Q. Did you receive information that you had been placed in nomination?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. Did you receive information that you had been elected?

A. No. It is strange to me that I should be elected when I wasn't even there. I can prove that I wasn't there, if that is what you mean.

Q. Did I say you weren't there?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No, but you are asking if I was elected at that Congress.

Q. Would it have been impossible to have elected you in your absence?

Mr. Gladstein: I will object to that——

Presiding Inspector: It is self-evident. You don't gain [6006] anything by asking this witness about that. You may ask him if he ever heard of it, if you wish to. If you ask him about what occurred some place where he wasn't present, it isn't very important.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Have you ever been connected with the American League Against War and Fascism?

A. Do you mean as a member?

Q. Yes. A. No.

Q. In what way were you connected with it?

A. Well, do you mean if we ever supported their policies or endorsed certain actions they took in the union?

Q. In whatever manner.

A. Well, I would say in the latter way; certainly, yes.

Q. In what latter way—what do you mean?

A. It seems to me that the League——

Q. (Interposing): Not what it seems to you—in what way were you connected with the American League Against War and Fascism—just the facts?

A. Only by supporting certain policies, or things that they advocated. That is the only way I can think of.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What policies of the American League against War [6007] and Fascism did you advocate and support? A. We were against——

Q. (Interposing) "We"—you mean who, I am asking you?

A. Well, boil it down to myself,—I was against a shipment of munitions and materials to Mussolini; also during the campaign against Ethiopia. I was against any assistance to France in Spain. For years we have been opposed to shipments of munitions and other things to Japan. And certainly we have always been opposed—I have always been opposed to any support of Hitler.

The American League——

Q. (Interposing): Are you now opposed to any support to Hitler?

A. We have never changed—I never have.

Q. Has the American League Against War and Fascism changed? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Is there such a thing as an American League Against War and Fascism at the present time?

A. Is there any such thing?

Q. Yes?

A. No. I think it went out of business.

Q. When was it out of business?

A. I don't know. [6008]

Q. What?

A. Some time recently, I think.

Q. Did you adopt or support any program against shipping munitions, or giving any aid to the Soviet Union? A. We in the union?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. In the Union, at any time, any place, anywhere?

A. Not that I remember; not that I remember any single case. We supported all nations that were opposed to what was going on at that time.

Q. I am only asking you about the Soviet Union.

A. You can't pick out one.

Presiding Inspector: How is this of any materiality?

Mr. Del Guercio: It indicates, if your Honor please, the witness' attitude.

Presiding Inspector: But you have implied that this was to the contrary. You say, "Have you ever opposed aid to the Soviet Union?" Was there any proposal for aid? It doesn't advance it any. I think you have got everything there is about that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What other policies of the American League Against War and Fascism did you support?

A. I don't remember any others.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't remember others; there might have been others. [6009]

Q. Did you give any financial support to the American League Against War and Fascism?

A. You mean did I personally, or individually?

Q. Let us take yourself individually, first.

A. Not that I remember. I think now and again I bought a few buttons for it. I remember Dietrich was a great button seller for them.

Q. You bought buttons yourself?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes, for two-bits, 25 cents, or a dollar.

Q. Did you send any money to them?

A. Only in that way—I don't recall making any other contributions.

Q. Did you speak on behalf of the American League Against War and Fascism at any time?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. Have you ever spoken at any place, any time, under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism?

A. Not that I know of, or even recall. I have spoken a great many places, and it is barely possible, but I don't recall any specific occasions; no.

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have our afternoon recess?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

[6010]

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: If you will bear with me for a moment.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, certainly. We will run over a little this afternoon because of conferences.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am trying to weed out certain matters.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. Take as much time as you need.

Mr. Del Guercio: We will save time this way.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, I want to direct your attention to this 1936-'37 strike. When was that strike first called?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. October 28, 1936.

Q. That is the date that they actually went out on strike? A. Yes.

Q. Who called that strike?

A. The strike was voted by all the maritime unions affiliated with the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

Q. They were all A. F. of L. Unions, were they not? A. Yes.

Q. And you were at that time what?

A. That is incorrect, that they were all A. F. of L. Unions. At least one of them, I think, had been suspended. [6011]

Q. I am speaking now of the West Coast.

A. Maybe more. That's what I am.

Q. Yes.

A. I am pretty sure that the Sailor's Union of the Pacific was functioning at that time as the Sailor's Union of the Pacific Emergency Committee, suspended and expelled from the American Federation of Labor. I believe the Marine Cooks & Stewards, and the Firemen's Union, the Pacific Coast Marine Firemen's Union was somewhat in the same status.

Q. Now, were you President of your own union at that time, the ILA?

A. No, I was President of the Pacific Coast District of the ILA.

Q. Pacific Coast District of the ILA?

A. That's right.

Q. Did you hold any position in your union?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. My Local Union?

Q. Your Local Union?

A. No. I don't think I did at that time.

Q. And weren't you also an international officer of the A. F. of L.? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. I was the Vice-President of the State A. F. of L. [6012]

Q. Vice-President of the State A. F. of L. Now, this Pacific Coast District, who elected you to that office?

A. The Pacific District membership by Australian ballot.

Q. What was Joe Ryan's position at that time?

A. International President of the ILA.

Q. And were you not the international representative on the West Coast at that time??

A. Of the ILA?

Q. Of the ILA. A. Oh, yes.

Q. Was that an appointive job or an elective job?

A. In so far as being on the payroll was concerned of the International, an appointive position; in so far as——

Q. (Interposing) Now, in that connection who paid your salary?

A. The International Union, Joe Ryan.

Q. How much were you getting?

A. What's that?

Q. What was your salary?

A. $75.00 a week.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Now, in addition to that you occupied what positions? A. You mean in the ILA?

Q. Yes. A. Or any other position? [6013]

Q. Any other positions?

A. Well, for a period, as I have said, I was a Vice-President of the State A. F. of L. of California.

Q. Did that carry a salary? A. What?

Q. Did that carry a salary?

A. Oh, no. I was the President of the San Francisco Bay Area District Council of the Maritime Federation.

Q. Did that carry a salary?

A. No. No other position carried a salary except my one position as President of the District.

Q. Well now, what was your salary as President of the District? A. What is that?

Q. What was your salary as President of the District?

A. $75.00 a week. But the way it was handled was this:——

Q. (Interposing) Well now, so that all together you were receiving $150.00 a week?

A. No, I was not.

Q. Why?

A. I was on the International payroll at $75.00 a week by virtue of my position as the District President.

Q. Did you have any other salary other than that? A. No other salary whatsoever. [6014]

Q. And what were your duties as International District Officer?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. My duties were prescribed first of all by the constitution of the District and, secondly, they were also prescribed to some degree by the International President himself.

Q. And that was Joe Ryan?

A. Joe Ryan.

Q. Now, your Local—that is, your Local ILA, No.—what was that number? What was the number of your Local?

A. 38-79, the Local I belonged to.

Q. Did it go on strike?

A. All the Locals went on strike.

Q. All the Locals went on strike. Now, did any A. F. of L. Unions on the East Coast go on strike at the same time? A. Yes.

Q. Who?

A. The Masters, Mates & Pilots Organization.

Q. When did they go on strike?

A. I think at the same time, October 28. I might be incorrect as to that, but I think that's correct.

Q. Any other union? Was the Masters, Mates & Pilots, was that a sympathetic strike or was it a strike of its own?

A. No, the Masters, Mates & Pilots struck on the West Coast and they struck on certain ships on the East Coast. I am [6015] not sure whether they struck all ships, but they struck some ships as a National Organization, and certain of the seafaring unions.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Under the A. F. of L.?

A. Yes. The Marine Firemen on the East Coast were A. F. of L. at that time.

Q. Did they strike?

A. They struck. Their strike was later declared illegal, but the strike was voted by the membership.

Q. Did they actually cease work? A. Yes.

Q. Did they go back to work when the strike was declared illegal? A. No. Some of them did.

Q. Any other A. F. of L. Union on the East Coast?

Presiding Inspector: On the East Coast?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

A. I don't think so. I don't—not A. F. of L. Union.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. So that on October 29th the only A. F. of L. Unions that went on strike were the Masters, Mates & Pilots and the Marine Firemen's Union?

A. On the East Coast?

Q. Yes, on the East Coast?

A. Well, of course you will have to understand the [6016] position of the Marine Firemen and the Marine Cooks & Stewards on the East Coast. They were still affiliated with the A. F. of L. They were later suspended because of this strike action from the A. F. of L., or the fight was going on at that time, and the International Officers of those unions declared them suspended for some technical or

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

through some technical methods or other. So, really, you could say that all the East Coast seamen's Unions were in the A. F. of L. at that time. They had not been expelled or suspended.

Q. Did you take up as International Officer the question of your going back East in December, 1936 with either the local unions here on the Pacific Coast or with Joe Ryan? A. Yes.

Q. All right. Now, let us take your local unions first. With what unions did you take it up?

A. All of them.

Q. All. In what manner?

A. They were notified as to exactly what our plans were.

Q. Not what "our" plans were. I am talking about "your" plans, what your plans were. Did you take that up?

A. Just a moment! What do you mean by "my" plans?

Q. What do you mean by "our" plans? Who else was in it? [6017]

A. I mean the plans of the ILA Strike Committee.

Q. Was there an ILA Strike Committee?

A. Oh, yes. A Coast Strike Committee.

Q. Were you connected with it?

A. I was Chairman of it.

Q. All right. Now, what action was taken?

A. There was arrangements made to call upon Joe Ryan to live up to a promise he had made to support us at a conference held in New York in

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

September, 1936. That was attended by Matt Meehan and myself. And at that conference the International pledged us full support, if we had to strike for the demands as we outlined them at that time. When the question came to get that support the support was not forthcoming and eventually we set a deadline on the West Coast to give Joe Ryan and the East Coast International Offisers —we set a deadline as to when they would make good on the support that had been officially passed upon and promised. I think that deadline was December 20th, and if the support was not forth coming by that time we were to urge the East Coast longshoremen to strike in our support in defiance of Joe Ryan and, in return for striking in our support, we would promise the East Coast longshoremen that we would not return to work on the West Coast until they had reached a settlement of any demands or any grievances they had on the East Coast. And at the time I left to go East, a couple of days [6018] before, we notified all unions by letter as to these plans asking——

Q. (Interposing) Whom do you mean by "we", "We notified all Locals"?

A. I notified them on behalf of the Longshore Coast Committee.

Q. All right. Now, in what manner did you notify them?

A. I notified them by letter and they were asked to——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Interposing): Just a minute, please. You notified them by letter? A. Yes.

Q. You signed the letter? A. Yes.

Q. And what did you say in the letter?

A. It's in evidence here.

Q. Is that the letter you refer to.

A. The letter of December 10th.

Q. I have here Alien's Exhibits 37, 34 and 32. Will you tell me which letter you have in mind?

A. This is it.

Presiding Inspector: Which does he refer to?

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir? Referring to Alien's Exhibit 37.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That is correct? [6019]

A. That's right.

Q. Now, as I understand your testimony, it is that you sent letters to all Locals that you were going to take a trip to the East Coast for the purpose of pulling out the longshoremen there, is that correct? A. Right, under certain conditions.

Q. Now, was anyone to go with you?

A. I don't remember at that time. Nobody did, except Meriwether and Charlot. They went back in connection with the activities——

Q. (Interposing) Were they part of your delegation? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Of your delegation?

A. We all went back for the same reason, but they did not go back specifically to speak to the longshoremen. They went back in conjunction

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

with their own organizations and difficulties with their organizations along the same line. In other words, their national organizations were withdrawing support and that's why they went back, the same reason as I was, practically.

Q. Did you ask them to go along with you?

A. No. I think that the—I didn't ask them. I think that was action of the Joint Committee. I am not sure. I think it was.

Q. Now, did you tell your Local Unions in this letter [6020] anything about going back there to speak at Boston, Philadelphia?

A. I don't know. I didn't read the letter.

Q. I thought you read it? A. No.

Q. Is there anything in this letter wherein you advised your Locals that you were going back to speak at Madison Square Garden, Boston, Philadelphia or elsewhere?

A. I think so. "To dispatch an ILA delegation to the East Coast which will attempt to cover the ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia".

Q. What delegation was that?

A. Well, in this case I was the delegation.

Q. Huh? A. From the ILA.

Q. It was a one-man delegation, is that it, and you were it?

A. Maybe they figured that was enough.

Q. Who was to pay your expenses?

A. Well, I explained how that happened. So

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

long as the East Coast offered to pay my expenses our West Coast Committee, being somewhat thrifty, I guess, said "O.K. with us".

Q. Did you tell your Local that the East Coast had offered to pay your expenses?

A. Oh, yes. They knew all about it.

Q. When? When did you tell them that?

[6020A]

A. Well, I am sure that they knew before I left. My own Strike Committee knew it.

Q. Who on your Strike Committee knew it?

A. And I reported that they had paid my expenses after I returned because I remember making the report the way——

Q. (Interposing) I am speaking of the time before you left. A. Yes.

Q. Who on the Strike Committee knew that the East Coast was to pay your expenses?

A. The entire Committee.

Q. Give me some of their names, the persons that knew. A. Our ILA Strike Committee?

Q. Yes. Is that the Committee you refer to?

A. I am referring to both the ILA Committee and the Joint Committee.

Q. Well, who knew? Do you understand my question?

A. Yes. I understand very well and you are getting an answer.

Q. Yes. Who knew on either Committee before your leaving for New York that your expenses were to be paid by the East Coast?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. All of them. [6021]

Q. Huh? A. All of them.

Q. Will you give me the names of some of them that knew?

A. Instead of me trying to remember the names, let me submit you an official list tomorrow or some other time of the members of the Committee.

Q. You don't know at this time?

A. Yes. I know a lot of them.

Q. Give me the names of those that you do know.

A. I will give you the names first of the ILA Strike Committee or the ILA Executive Committee. There was myself, Chairman; Matt Meehan, Secretary; Con Negsted was——

Q. (Interposing). Let's go to Matt Meehan. Did Matt Meehan know that your expenses were to be paid by the East Coast prior to your departure? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: All right.

Presiding Inspector: He said that everyone.

The Witness: Con Negsted was another member of the Committee. F. Ward was another member. A. Larson was another member. That's all I can think of with certainty, for this reason: That the Committee changed.

By Mr. Del Guercio: [6022]

Q. Without regard to your reason——

A. (Interposing) I might get somebody on

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

there that wasn't on there at that time, but I can submit you an official list of the members of that Committee.

Q. What was the other Committee?

A. The other Committee was the Joint Coast Committee. There was three or four Committees. If you want the names of the Joint Coast Strike Committee——

Q. (Interposing) How many were there on the Joint Committee?

A. Oh, there were four or five from each Union; about 40 or 50 all told.

Q. Now, isn't it a fact that the purpose of your going to the East Coast at that time was to confer with Joe Ryan?

A. Part of it, yes; very definitely.

Q. Well now, that was the primary purpose, was it not? A. Oh, no.

Q. Huh?

A. No. The letter shows you otherwise, and the minutes will show you otherwise. One of the things that I was supposed to do, and it was done, was to call upon Joe Ryan and demand that he give us the support that he had promised us, and after waiting around in New York for two or three days I [6023] managed to crash past Joe Ryan and his gangsters and talk to him.

Q. Now, was Joe Curran at that time connected with any union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. The position of the entire East Coast seamen was that they were still affiliated and been illegally suspended.

Q. Then Joe Curran was not, as I understand your testimony, affiliated with any A. F. of L. Union?

A. Well, it all depends on how you look at it.

Q. Well, was he or wasn't he?

A. Yes; in my opinion, definitely.

Q. And in the opinion of the International Officers?

A. Oh, no. Definitely the other way.

Q. Whom did Joe Curran represent at that time?

A. East Coast Seamen's Strike Committee.

Q. And whom did the East Coast Strike Committee represent at that time?

A. The East Coast Seamen on strike, and a lot of them that weren't, I guess.

Q. They were the rank and file seamen, weren't they? A. That's right.

Q. And they were not connected with any A. F. of L. Union, were they?

A. They were all members of the ISU.

Q. Was that an A. F. of L. Union? [6024]

A. International Seamen's Union of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Q. And you say that they had been outlawed because of their——

A. (Interposing) I think that Curran's testimony on that point is better than mine. He

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

officially participated. The membership voted to strike and the officials walked out of the meeting then and the membership carried on.

Q. The officials did not want them to go out on strike? A. That is correct.

Q. And they went out notwithstanding?

A. That's right.

Q. And they didn't go out then as an A. F. of L. Union but rank and file?

A. Oh, no. Because the officials didn't want the strike doesn't say that they didn't go out as an A. F. of L. Union.

Presiding Inspector: We have got the fact. The conclusions we can draw. [6025]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, when you returned from the east coast did you make a report to anyone?

A. Yes; I made—sure, I made a report, I think, to all the ports on the coast; all the big ports, and I made it to a mass meeting in San Francisco. I made quite a few reports on that. And, of course, I made it to the Joint Strike Committee, and my own Strike Committee.

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio showed Mr. Gladstein a book of convention proceedings.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have here the proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the Pacific Coast District No. 38, International Longshoremen's Association——

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) '37.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: '38.

Mr. Grossman: He is speaking of District No. 38.

Mr. Del Guercio: Pacific Coast District No. 38.

Mr. Gladstein: I thought you said 1938 proceedings.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing) ——of May 3 to 22, 1937, covering that period. Mr. Bridges, have you ever seen that before?

A. (Examining proceedings) Yes. This looks like a copy of our official convention minutes of the convention that was supposed—I forget—I think it is the 28th [6026] or 29th Annual Convention of the District.

Q. Now, reading from page 120 of these proceedings:

"At this time also the District Executive Board decided to send me to the east coast to survey the situation and see what could be done to get support of the Atlantic ILA and in conjunction with the publicity program in an attempt to exert added pressure on the shipowners to break down their refusal to arrive at a settlement."

Did you make such a statement?

A. That is my statement.

Q. That is your statement?

A. In the official minutes.

Q. (Continuing):

"Attempts to get some action and support of the East Coast Longshoremen to the East Coast rank

and file seamen on strike although having some little results were mainly fruitless."

A. Right.

Q. (Continuing):

"However, the East Coast seamen despite the greatest odds and obstacles were making a valiant although losing fight and the West Coast ILA and Maritime Unions owed them a never to be forgotten debt for their fight and support on our behalf."

Did you make that statement? [6027]

A. Not only at the convention, but I made a similar report when I returned from the east.

Q. (Continuing):

"I proceeded to New York, attended a mass meeting of seamen, also attended meetings of longshoremen and seamen in Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore." A. Yes.

Q. (Continuing):

"It was apparent, however, to myself on arrival on the east coast that the possibility of any broad action from the longshoremen was nil. We were able to institute some action in the ports of New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia, such as having some longshore locals refuse ot work ships. It was at this time that I met with J. P. Ryan and the Atlantic District Executive Board and was informed I was no longer a member of the International Executive Council or on the payroll of the International."

Is that correct. A. Correct.

Q. (Continuing):

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"After staying four days on the east coast, I returned to the west coast. However, one thing happened while east that was noticeable, and that was the publicity to the effect that the West Coast Strike was almost over.

"The question came up this morning about carrying out [6028] the orders of the District Executive Board. Those were concurred in by all locals, I understand. When we discussed it on the Executive Board, we had certain information that we didn't know how authentic it was—that possibly we could get the support of the east coast longshoremen. The seamen requested me to go back and attend a mass meeting, paid the expenses—the District didn't pay them.

"In regard to carrying out orders. The orders were carried out, but just a bit too good for Mr. Ryan. When I got to New York I found he was not in but was in Albany and I was not going to hang around and wait for him and waste a day. I went to Philadelphia that night and attended a mass meeting. I went to Boston, and then to Baltimore, where they tied up ships the next morning."

Is that correct? A. Substantially; yes.

Q. What orders were you talking about there in that paragraph?

A. I think you would have to read what I referred to during the rendering of the report. Somebody raised a question of what I was doing back there, and he raised the question in defense of Joe Ryan. He happened to be, I believe, one of the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

people that was a recognized supporter and an adherent of Joe Ryan and actually left our union when it went CIO, and he was bringing up the fact that when I had gone back [6029] east I had not carried out the orders of the Executive Committee.

Q. What were the orders of the executive Committee with respect to your going back east?

A. The letter of December 10th, in evidence.

Q. Were they orders, or was that your letter?

A. That was an official letter of the Executive Committee. And just what I say is true—The orders were carried out so well that I got fired.

Q. And you are referring to Alien's Exhibit No. 37?

A. Yes; orders of the Executive Committee.

Q. That was signed by yourself, was it not?

A. As Chairman of the Board.

Q. Pacific Coast District Executive Committee?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any mention in this letter about arrangements having been made for you to speak at Philadelphia, Boston, New York, or elsewhere?

A. What I think you was referring to here. I have got evidence that we did. I have got evidence, I have a telegram wiring back east before I left, to make arrangements to speak.

Q. Is there anything in this exhibit, Alien's Exhibit 37, to the effect that arrangements had been made for you to speak at New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore or Boston? [6030] A. Yes.

Q. Where? A. In the first paragraph.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Will you read the first paragraph?

A. (Reading) "(1) To dispatch an ILA delegation to the east coast which will attempt to cover the ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia, and appeal to the longshoremen there, members of the ILA, to immediately refrain from performing any further work on inter-coastal ships operated by companies that the ILA, Pacific Coast District, is at present striking against."

Q. That is the only thing in that letter with reference to arrangements having been made for you to speak?

A. That is certainly enough, as far as I can see it, taken into consideration with what actually was done. I wasn't going to go back in the dark, with the short space of time we had. Those arrangements were made before that letter was ever written.

Q. Now, as a matter of fact, you had made those arrangements with Joe Curran, isn't that right?

A. Yes. I had made the arrangements partly through Joe Curran, partly through Rathbone, partly by direct contact with Foster.

Q. Did you make any such arrangements with Joe Ryan? A. To meet—— [6031]

Q. Did Joe Ryan know you were going back east at those places? A. Oh, yes.

Q. When did you notify Joe Ryan?

A. We notified Joe Ryan by——

Q. (Interposing) Do you mean by letter?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I did, as Chairman of the Board.

Q. When did you notify Joe Ryan?

A. At the end of November.

Q. The end of November?

A. I think; yes.

Q. Well, now, had arrangements been made for you to go to the East Coast to speak at the end of November?

A. I can tell you everything that happened if you want me to.

Q. Do you have a copy of that letter that you sent to Joe Ryan?

A. I am referring to a letter—yes, I have got a copy of it.

Q. Where is it?

A. It is a letter dated November 29th.

Q. Do you have it here?

A. They (indicating counsel) should have it there.

Mr. Del Guercio: Will counsel mind getting the letter?

Mr. Gladstein: He says it is in evidence—are you [6032] referring to a letter in evidence?

The Witness: The letter of November 29 or thereabouts.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Is it in evidence, or has your counsel got it?

A. I am not sure—I don't remember. It might be, but I don't think so.

Q. What did you say in this letter to Joe Ryan about going back east to speak?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. The letter was addressed to Joe Ryan, pointing out that he was strike-breaking—we called him as much—and that we demanded that he live up to the promises that he had made us for our support.

Q. Was there anything in that letter about you going to the east coast to speak?

A. I am just trying to remember.

Q. That is the only question.

Presiding Inspector: I suppose the letter would be the best evidence.

A. (Continuing): I am not quite sure. That is why I wanted to look at the letter. I think it is all connected up.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Try and look for it. First, you say you might have the letter here?

A. My going back east——.

Mr. Gladstein: We are looking for the letter.

[6033]

The Witness: My going back east was a follow-up of the letter. I am not sure whether it says specifically in the letter that I am going to go back east; but all these letters that were written, copies of them always went to Joe Ryan, and were published in the papers, published in our Organ—and all the rest of it. Joe knew I was coming back. He had a couple of people there to meet me.

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein passed a letter to the witness.)

The Witness: There is nothing in this particular letter (indicating) that specifically indicates that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What you are referring to now is a letter handed to you by your counsel?

A. Yes—a letter dated November 29, one of our official letters.

Q. And there is nothing in that letter referring to your going back east?

A. Nothing in there that indicates or specifically says that I will——

Q. (Interposing): Nothing that indicates that you will be going back east?

A. It only indirectly indicates that.

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein passed another letter to the witness.)

The Witness: The same with this letter (indicating). [6034] This is a letter dated November 28th. It doesn't specifically refer to a delegation going back but indirectly.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Then, as I understand you, you have nothing to show that you notified Joe Ryan that you were going back east to speak?

A. No, not specifically in these letters. It is possible there is some communication. I would have to look and see.

Q. Will you make a search for such a communication?

Mr. Gladstein: We shall.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And let me know tomorrow about it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That is a letter, or a wire, or something showing Joe Ryan that I was bound back east?

Q. Anything.

A. Yes. I can make a search for one. I am pretty sure I will find one.

Q. Now, when had you definitely decided to go back east to speak at those places?

A. When?

Q. Yes. A. December 9th.

Q. Before this letter of December 10th had been written? A. Yes. [6035]

Q. Alien's Exhibit 37?

A. Yes. I couldn't go back—we were still making arrangements for meetings. We had a meeting going on here December 8th, and we couldn't set a definite time.

Q. Were you a free agent at that time—could you determine your own trips? A. Oh, no.

Q. Huh? A. No, sir.

Q. You had to get authority, didn't you?

A. And how!

Q. And so you couldn't have gone back east without getting authority from someone?

A. Right.

Q. Who did you have to get the authority from?

A. My executive committee.

Q. You didn't have any authority to go back east to speak, did you, on December 9, 1936?

A. I had it before that; yes, had it before that.

Q. Do you have any evidence of that, other than

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

this letter of December 10, 1936, signed by yourself?

A. Yes. I think you will—we have got the evidence in the minutes of the Executive Committee, and certainly it is indicated in the letter of November 29 as part of the major program. [6036]

Q. Did you tell anyone that you had arranged with Joe Ryan to speak——

A. (Interposing) I am sure we did.

Q. (Continuing): ——prior to your going out there to speak at Madison Square Garden, and Philadelphia, and Boston, and Baltimore?

A. Yes. Our Committee certainly knew it, and I know that when I was up north it was known, and my attorneys have got a set of teletypes and telegrams that indicate it.

Q. Now, you didn't meet Joe Ryan, did you, in New York upon your arrival there?

A. No. He was in Albany attending a session of the Legislature.

Q. How did you know that?

A. Well, I was first informed, I believe, by the press.

Q. When? A. When I hit there.

Q. What did they say about it? Did you ask the press there as to where Ryan was?

A. The press—of course, every time I hit New York at that time they wanted to know what I was going to do to Joe Ryan, or what Joe Ryan was going to do to me. There seemed to be quite a lot of interest in it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Where was this? Immediately upon your alighting from the airplane? [6037]

A. That is generally where they get down to see me at New York.

Q. Where? A. At the air field.

Q. And what did they say? A. Well,——

Q. (Interposing): Did they ask you why you were coming to New York?

A. They apparently knew.

Q. Huh?

A. You see, what you have got to understand——

Q. (Interposing) Wait now! You are getting off the airplane and the press is interviewing you. What did they say to you?

A. They asked me how far I thought I would get in the program that I had come to New York and the east coast to put over, the program that had been published in the press.

Q. Now, did they say anything about your speaking there? A. Yes.

Q. At Madison Square Garden?

A. Well, I don't know about that.

Q. Huh? A. I don't recall that.

Q. Did they say anything about your going down to Philadelphia to speak? [6038]

A. I don't recall that.

Q. Did they say anything about your going to Baltimore to speak?

A. I don't remember. I don't remember if we——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Interposing): Did they say anything about your going to Boston to speak?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Then you weren't interviewed concerning the speeches that you were to make at any of those places, were you, by the press?

A. I don't recall specifically. I was interviewed on the general nature of my trip back east.

Q. And did you tell them that you were going to speak at any of these places? Did you tell the press?

A. I don't recall what I told them.

Q. You know you didn't?

A. No. Here's what happened, if I remember. I was to go back there and I was to arrange a meeting with Ryan. Communications and wires and telephone calls had availed us nothing, and I was to see Ryan and finally say "Now, what's the score here? Do you back up what you promised us or don't you?" And if he refused we were going to try and contact the longshoremen in as large a number as possible everywhere we could, especially the ports that we had discussed.

Q. Now you are using "we" again. Who is your "we"? [6039]

A. Well, I mean "I" was in this case.

Q. There wasn't anybody else, was there?

A. No, not in this connection there wasn't. It was just myself.

Q. Joe Curran included?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Well, of course Joe was with me on these trips.

Q. Tommy Raye included? A. No.

Q. Roy Hudson included?

A. No. I was representing the West Coast longshoremen and I was able to do it without any help.

Q. Now, isn't it a fact that Roy Hudson had a lot to do with the rank and file seamen that were on strike at that time?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Didn't Joe Curran ever tell you anything about that? A. No, never.

Q. And wasn't that one of the things that you discussed with Roy Hudson when he came to your office there early in '36? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. Not that I remember.

Q. Didn't he talk to you about the situation in the [6040] east coast?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And the support you might receive out there?

A. Yes.

Q. If the west coast struck?

A. He talked, I believe, about the entire situation.

Q. And didn't he tell you what influence he had on the east coast? A. He might have.

Q. Didn't you meet Roy Hudson there upon your arrival in New York?

A. In New York?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Yes. A. No.

Q. Was he in New York at the time?

A. I don't know.

Q. Now, when did you see Joe Ryan?

A. When?

Q. Yes, on that trip.

A. Oh, I don't remember. I don't remember whether it was—I know it was before the Madison Square Garden meeting. Whether it was the same day in the morning or the day before, I'm not—I can't recall.

Q. That was how many days after your arrival in New York? [6041]

A. Well, I didn't see him the day I arrived. I doubt if I saw him the second day. It was either the second or third day after I arrived.

Q. And where did you see him?

A. When?

Q. Where? A. Right in his office.

Q. Was anybody with you?

A. He wouldn't talk to me. I didn't see Ryan. He wouldn't talk to me. He sat in the next office and sent one of his gangsters in to talk to me.

Q. Anybody with you? A. No, I was alone.

Q. And you went to see Joe Ryan in his office alone? A. That's right.

Q. And what did Joe Ryan tell you?

A. He wouldn't talk to me. He sent in a fellow named Owens to talk to me.

Q. What did Owens tell you?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. He would come in and tell me what Joe Ryan thought of me and I told him what I thought of Joe Ryan, and that's the way the things went on, and in the meantime the goon squad went around making dirty cracks at me, threatening to throw me out.

Q. Did they, literally? [6042]

A. Just about.

Q. Well, did they? A. Just about.

Q. Did they use force to throw you out?

A. Well, I would call it "force."

Q. They put their hands on you? A. Yes.

Q. And they threw you out? A. Yes.

Q. Now, Joe Ryan fired you, didn't he?

A. Oh, yes. That was done before I was thrown out.

Q. When was it done?

A. Before I was thrown out.

Q. Who told you that you were fired?

A. The ambassador that was passing backwards and forwards.

Q. Did he tell you why?

A. Did he tell me what?

Q. Did he tell you why? A. Sure.

Q. Why?

A. I was going against Joe Ryan.

Q. Did he tell you that it was because you hadn't obeyed orders?

A. I wasn't under Ryan's orders. [6043]

Q. Under whose orders were you?

A. Under west coast orders.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Weren't you also under Joe Ryan's orders?

A. No. I would have kept my job if I had done that.

Q. You were required to do that?

A. No, no. I was required to take orders from the west coast and the people who elected me.

Q. And as an International officer you weren't required to take any orders from Joe Ryan?

A. Not in conflict with my orders from the membership on the west coast.

Q. And what orders were in conflict with orders from the west coast?

A. Joe Ryan's orders.

Q. What were his orders?

A. Break the strike. Break the strike. That was his orders.

Q. Now, the west coast had ordered you to go to see Joe Ryan, hadn't they?

A. Right.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Had they ordered you in so many words to make a speech in the Madison Square Garden?

A. No. I don't think they did in so many words. [6044]

Q. Had they ordered you to make a speech in Philadelphia? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. They knew I was going there.

Q. I didn't ask you if they knew that you were going there. I asked you if they had given you orders to go back east to speak at Philadelphia.

A. They gave me orders to get all the support I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

could get in any way I could get it, and I carried out orders.

Q. But not to speak, did they?

A. Any way. That included speaking. They trusted my judgment some, and that included speaking or doing anything else that was legal.

Q. And is that—did they give you orders to go to the Communist Party headquarters in New York?

A. Not necessarily. Not that I remember. Completely unnecessary.

Q. Now, did you go to the Communist Party headquarters while you were in New York?

A. Never been to them in my life in New York. Don't even know where they are at.

Q. At any time? A. At any time.

Presiding Inspector: Can you finish this subject? [6045]

Mr. Del Guercio: No.

Presiding Inspector: Then we will recess until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 o'clock p. m. an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, June 3, 1941, at 10:00 o'clock a. m.) [6046]

Court Room 276,
Federal Building,
San Francisco, California.
June 3, 1941.

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A. M.

[6047]

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: Thank you.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, to go back to this trip of yours to the east coast in December, 1936. As I understand it, you had been ordered to go there to try and get the east coast longshoremen to declare a strike, is that right?

A. Providing Ryan wouldn't go through with the promise he had given us.

Q. That was your purpose in going to the east coast, to try and get the longshoremen to go out on strike?

A. Yes—and some of them went out.

Q. Now, under whose auspices were the meetings at Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, and the mass meeting in New York?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Under the auspices of the seamen in some cases, longshoremen in others. I think the meeting in Boston was under the auspices and arranged for by the longshoremen of Boston.

Q. The meeting at Boston—— [6048]

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment. I would like to speak to you a moment.

(Whereupon the Presiding Inspector conferred with Mr. Del Guercio.)

Presiding Inspector: We will take a brief recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Will you read the last question and answer, please?

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter as above recorded.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Well, what longshoremen union arranged for a meeting with the seamen, the mass meeting of the seamen at Boston?

A. I never said that. The meeting in Boston was arranged by the ILA.

Q. By what ILA?

A. The ILA; the union.

Presiding Inspector: The local union?

The Witness: Yes, the Boston Local of the ILA; the officials up there. I think the President of the Local arranged it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That ILA was, of course, an AF of L affiliate at that time?

A. Affiliate of our own International. [6049]

Q. And who with that ILA joined with the seamen to hold this mass meeting at Boston?

A. Marty Flaherty, the only one I remember. There were others.

Q. Was there any joint mass meeting with the joint longshoremen and seamen at any of the other places, at New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia.

A. The meeting at Philadelphia was longshoremen and seamen; mainly longshoremen.

Q. Did the local ILA there join with the seamen to hold that mass meeting? A. Yes.

Q. And who in Philadelphia with the longshoremen did that?

A. I don't remember the names of the local men.

Q. Now, as a matter of fact, all of those meetings at which you spoke were held solely under the auspices of the rank and file seamen headed by Joe Curran?

A. That is not so. I have got the records to show otherwise.

Q. Now, on this trip to the east coast did you make any contacts with east coast unions of the longshoremen? Did you yourself go on the floor of any longshoremen union on the east coast at either Boston, Philadelphia, New York or Baltimore?

A. Not at that time. Do you know how impos-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

sible it [6050] is to get a meeting of longshoremen on the east coast?

Presiding Inspector: No. Did you?

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I am speaking of this time that you went to the east coast to get the longshoremen on strike. Did you appear in any of those four days on the floor of any longshoremen east coast union?

A. And I am saying No, because such a thing would be a practical impossibility. There were no meetings of those unions. Some of the men I spoke to hadn't been in a union meeting for twenty years.

Q. Did you make any attempt before you left the west coast to contact any longshoremen union on the east coast?

A. I arranged the Boston meeting. I arranged the Boston meeting the early part of December.

[6051]

Q. Did you have any communication with any longshoremen union regarding the Boston meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Where are those communications?

A. My attorneys have some of them.

Mr. Gladstein: Do you want them?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

(The communications referred to were passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you have any communication with any

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

longshoremen union in Philadelphia regarding your speaking there?

A. No. We wired Curran to arrange that.

Q. Now, you knew that Curran wasn't connected with any longshoremen union, didn't you?

A. I knew he had more connections than many of the so-called longshore leaders.

Q. Did you also wire to Roy Hudson to make the same connections?

A. Not necessarily. I wired to Curran

Q. Well, did you wire to Roy Hudson?

A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No. [6052]

Q. Did you wire to Tommy Raye?

A. No.

Q. Did you wire to anybody in the Communist Party? A. Not at all.

Q. To make arrangements?

A. We have got the wires to who I wired to.

Q. Do you have the wires to the Communist Party?

A. I wired and telephoned to the official people back there that we were working with.

Q. Now, this Flaherty that you speak of in Boston, he's a member of the Communist Party isn't he? A. He is not.

Q. Huh? A. He is not.

Q. Is he still with the A. F. of L?

A. He is still, I think, the president of the Longshore Council out there, or of the Longshore Union.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I don't know what his official office is now, but he was at that time.

Q. Now, your counsel here has handed to me two telegrams here received from——

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) There are three of them.

By Mr Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing): Thomas. Who is Thomas?

A. I know a half a dozen. Which one do you want?

Q. J. E. Thomas.

A. I think he was the Chairman of the Sailors' Strike [6053] Committee in Boston at that time.

Q. He wasn't connected with any longshoremen union, was he? A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Huh?

A. I think so. I think in a time like that everybody is connected with the unions on strike.

Q. Did he belong to any longshoremen union, J. E. Thomas?

A. He might have. I don't know. I don't think so.

Q. Well, you weren't communicating with him as an official of any longshoremen union, were you?

A. No, not necessarily.

Q. He wasn't communicating with you as an official of any longshoremen union?

A. He was communicating with me in conjunction with Flaherty.

Q. He was communicating with you as Chairman of the Strike Committee on the East Coast?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Of the Sailors' Strike Committee.

Q. Not the Longshoremen Strike Committee?

A. In conjunction with the longshoremen.

Q. The longshoremen went on strike on the East Coast? [6054]

A. There were a few. After we got through there was.

Q. But not at the time you went East?

A. They had all taken a vote to strike, but they were not allowed to strike.

Q. Then they weren't on strike?

A. Well, it all depends. Up in Boston and up in Connecticut, a few other places around there, they were refusing to load West Coast ships. Now, maybe they weren't on strike. Technically, according to Ryan, the action was illegal. But they went in our support and they had refused to load the ships bound for the West Coast.

Q. And, as a matter of fact, you didn't carry out the orders of your locals here on this trip to the East Coast, did you?

A. Well, between what you say and what my convention said I'll go by the convention.

Q. And you know, and, as a matter of fact, you were just camouflaging that trip to the East Coast?

A. In what way?

Q. In every way. You were going out there on orders of the Communist Party, weren't you?

A. Not at all. It's all in the records how I went there, why I went there, and I reported back to my Executive Committee in the convention and my re-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

port was approved, except for the agents in the convention. [6055]

Q. Do you know how much money was collected at the Madison Square Garden meeting in December, 1936?

A. You mean in the collection itself?

Q. All. A. The whole thing?

Q. The collection and the tickets; the money received from the sale of admission tickets?

A. No. I think Curran's recollection is better than mine on that.

Q. Did you ever have any independent knowledge of how much was collected?

A. At no time.

Q. How much did Joe Curran tell you was collected?

A. He told everybody on the witness stand. I forget the figures now. I think he said about $3,500, he said. That is the paid admission and the collection. All that I remember was that the sum was announced before we left the meeting and it was published in the newspapers the next day.

Q. Is that the first time you had any knowledge as to how much was collected at the time Joe Curran testified here on the witness stand?

A. No. I heard the amount announced at the meeting. It was announced before the meeting was over.

Q. And who announced it?

A. I don't recall. It was either Lawrenson or McCuistion. [6056]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And did you receive any of that money?

A. I never received a nickel of the entire trip in cash.

Q. My question is, Did you receive any of that money that was collected at the Madison Square Garden meetings?

Presiding Inspector: Well, he said "No."

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Either by sale of the tickets, admission tickets or by collection?

A. I never received a nickel of it.

Q. Now, you never received a nickel of it?

A. Not a nickel.

Q. Now, on July 3, 1937 at the convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific in Portland, Oregon——you remember that, don't you?

A. What date?

Q. On July 3, 1937? A. Yes.

Q. Did you state in substance with regard to your trip to New York in December, 1936 as follows. "I am going to speak for the records. During the last strike I drew not one nickel in salary or in expenses during the entire time of the strike, not one nickel of it. The funds of the District were audited by the auditing committee of the District Convention and they found those statements entirely correct. I [6057] made a trip back East and the entire trip was paid by the East Coast seamen because I was to attend the mass meeting of the seamen and speak in their behalf. They collected

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

some $4,000 at the mass meeting. I assume some of the expenses, which was about $275.00 train fare, came out of that money."

Did you make such a statement at that time?

A. I believe I would make a statement along that line, yes.

Q. Then you did receive $275.00 from the money that was collected at that mass meeting?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. In New York? A. No, I didn't.

Q. Huh?

A. My ticket was paid for before I left the West Coast.

Q. Your ticket was paid for before. By whom?

A. I don't know the individuals, but we have got a telegram to show it.

Q. Could it have been paid for by Roy Hudson?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Could it have been paid for by Tom Raye?

A. No.

Q. You heard the testimony of Joe Curran here, didn't you? [6058] A. Yes.

Q. Did he say that money had been advanced to you from the East to pay for your transportation back East? A. No.

Q. And your testimony now is that it wasn't?

A. My testimony is that we wired East that I was coming and to arrange for the ticket in New York, and it was done before I ever left here.

Q. Well now, who gave you that $275.00?

A. I never got any $275.00.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Well, were you making a false statement when you gave that report before this Maritime Federation in Portland?

A. I think it is substantially correct.

Q. Well, where did that $275.00 come from?

A. That was the price of the ticket.

Q. And who gave it to you?

A. Who gave me the ticket?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, the East Coast seamen.

Q. Who and when?

A. Before I left the West Coast.

Q. And how was it sent to you? Through the mails?

A. Well, you don't do it that way.

Q. What did they do?

A. I would go down and get aboard the plane and my [6059] transportation was arranged for.

Q. Tell me how you did that. You went down to what airport?

A. I went down to Mills Field, if I left from San Francisco, which I did.

Q. What did you do?

A. You just go down and get aboard the plane and you are off.

Q. Without any ticket?

A. Without any ticket at all. That is, if they trust you. They mightn't do it for everybody.

Q. Did they have a ticket there for you?

A. Yes. That was the way it was done.

Q. Who purchased it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. The ticket was purchased in New York and they had word of it in San Francisco, and all you did was to board the plane, and that was before the meeting and before any collection was made. I have already told you that we sent a thousand dollars back East immediately after I returned to the West Coast. [6060]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Well, now, Curran's testimony that the seamen there on strike on the east coast were starving to death, didn't have a penny to spare, that was all untrue and false, is that correct?

A. No. It is perfectly true and correct. I saw that with my own eyes.

Q. You mean the seamen were starving to death and yet they had enough money to advance you $275 to pay for your round trip ticket?

A. They apparently did.

Q. They didn't need that money to feed the starving seamen on the east coast?

Mr. Gladstein: That is argumentative.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that all argument?

Mr. Gladstein: Very much so; and I object to it.

Presiding Inspector: I think you have the facts.

Mr. Gladstein: I have shown Mr. Del Guercio three telegrams, none of which he has chosen to use, and I have now given him a fourth telegram.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am about to use this telegram now. I only use it if I wish, regardless of what counsel hands me, but I use this.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Your counsel has given me what purports to be a copy [6061] of an RCA radiogram, dated December 10,—notice the date—December 10, 1936, addressed to Joseph Curran, Chairman, Strike Strategy Committee, 164 Eleventh Avenue, New York City, and signed by Mervyn Rathborne.

This wire reads:

"Harry will speak at mass meeting Madison Square Garden December fourteenth Stop."

You didn't speak at Madison Square Garden on December 14, did you?

A. No. I think it was two days later.

Q. (Continuing):

"Request you make immediate arrangements for round trip airplane ticket with United Air Lines and notify by telegraph Stop."

A. Right.

Q. (Continuing):

"In addition to public mass meeting also arrange mass meetings of longshoremen in Boston and New York Stop."

So that Mervyn Rathborne then was arranging for the mass meetings in Boston and in New York, and not the seamen on the east coast?

A. Do you want me to answer that?

Q. Can you answer it?

A. Sure I can.

Presiding Inspector: He asked the questions. I suppose he [6062] wants you to answer.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Rathborne was the Secretary of the Committee, and communications that went out generally went out signed by Rathborne. That is what the Secretary of the Committee is for. I didn't sit down and send the communications off. Rathborne used to take care of those things. He was the Secretary of the Committee and he operated in the office. I was getting around here, there and everywhere. Those meetings were arranged by me and Rathborne was just transmitting the arrangements from me to Joe Curran, and that is what that telegram means.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. It ends:

"Acknowledge receipt and keep us posted as to arrangements." A. That is right.

Q. What does the "ABAJCF" mean there?

A. That was so the other end would know that no agency of the employers, or any other kind of agency, were doing a little spying and sending phony telegrams.

Q. You wanted to keep this secret?

A. No. Do you want an explanation of that? I can give it to you.

Q. I know you can. A. You bet. [6063]

Q. Having seen this wire, do you want to change your testimony that you gave here just this morning—not yesterday or several years ago—that you had made arrangements for that Boston meeting upon your return from the northwest prior to December 10th?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No. I made the arrangements before I returned..

Q. Huh?

A. Before this telegram was sent and before I returned from the northwest. We have telegrams to show that too.

Q. You don't want to make any explanation of that?

A. Oh, yes, I will explain.

When I was in the northwest—I left San Francisco November 29—and I had to speak at a meeting in Seattle November 30, and I spoke there. I also spoke at meetings in Astoria, In Aberdeen, in Portland. Then I came back to San Francisco.

While I was in the northwest at some point or other I spoke to Boston by long distance telephone, and arranged the meeting tentatively in Boston—maybe not the exact date—but all the other arrangements; told them to procure a hall, told them to get the arrangements set up, and all the rest of it, and that we would be back there. I done it in the northwest before I returned to San Francisco.

This (indicating radiogram) is in the nature of a confirmation. We have the teletypes and telegrams to show that [6064] too, with the telephone numbers.

Q. Now, I believe you testified here on direct examination that you were in the hospital in June 1935, is that correct?

A. The best part of it; the best part of June.

Q. What? A. The best part of June.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. The best part of June?

A. Yes. I went to the hospital May 28.

Q. Had you at that time been insured with the IWO?

A. No, never been insured in the IWO.

Q. Do you know what the IWO is?

A. Yes.

Q. What is it?

A. International Workers Order. It is kind of a fraternal or benefit society.

Q. Isn't it an insurance organization set up by the Communist Party?

A. Not that I know of. You had better ask somebody that is in it.

Q. Do you know Max Bedacht?

A. I met him for the first time about two months ago.

Q. You heard that about two months ago?

A. No. I met him for the first time about two months ago. I was in a meeting where he spoke.

[6065]

Q. Do you know him as being the head of the IWO? A. I didn't, and I don't now.

Q. Who treated you while you were in the hospital? A. Who treated me?

Q. Yes.

A. You mean the doctors, the nurses, or who?

Q. Doctors?

A. I had three doctors; one was Dr. Korshet—K-o-r-s-h-e-t—I think it is; and——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Interposing) Let us stay with Dr. Korshet. Wasn't he the doctor for the IWO?

A. I don't know.

Q. Who made arrangements for you to have Dr. Korshet?

A. I don't know that. I think some of my friends on the waterfront did.

Q. Schneidermannn?

A. I don't think it would be Schneidermann. He wasn't even in the city.

Q. Was it Darcy that made the arrangements?

A. I don't see why; I don't think so. The state I was in I wasn't worrying about who made the arrangements for the doctor. I would have taken him regardless of who made the arrangements.

Q. As a matter of fact, it was Norma Perry—P-e-r-r-i e—no, P-e-r-r-y—who made the arrangements, [6066] wasn't it?

A. I don't know. I think I was out at that time; unconscious. That is entirely possible.

Q. And Miss Norma Perry had been assigned to you as your Secretary by Sam Darcy?

A. She had not been assigned to me; no.

Q. Was Norma Perry your secretary at that time?

A. I think she was at that time; yes. She was not assigned to me by anybody except the longshore Executive Board, and somewhat against my will.

Q. How did she get employed with you?

A. She came down on the waterfront during the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

1934 strike here, as did a group of other people, quite a few.

Q. Group of what other people—who were the others?

A. I am trying to recall. There were dozens of people at that time coming down and volunteering their services, such as stenographers, this and that and other thing, and some of them we accepted and some we didn't.

I remember once I fired a whole bunch out of the strike headquarters.

Q. Let us stick with Norma Perry.

A. Yes—and I am saying that somehow she got back.

Q. All right. Did she tell you who sent her down there? A. At that time, no. [6067]

Q. Did she tell you at any other time?

A. Not that I recall. I had very grave suspicions as to who sent her down there.

Q. Did she tell you that Sam Darcy had sent her down there?

A. I don't recall that. She was very well acquainted with Darcy and everybody.

Q. She was well acquainted with all the Communist Party leaders at that time, wasn't she?

A. Sure. She was so well acquainted with some of the people in the city that I got very suspicious of her. She was well acquainted with all the police, the District Attorney, and the employers, and everybody, and that is why I finally fired her.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. How long was Norma Perry with you?

A. I don't know. I can check the record.

Presiding Inspector: Your best recollection.

A. (Continuing) Somewhere around 1935.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. For how long a period?

A. From the 1934 strike, the first or second month of the 1934 strike, to around the end of 1935, I think.

Q. Over a year? A. Oh, yes; over a year.

Q. About two years? [6068]

A. Might have been.

Q. She first came to you during the 1934 strike?

A. Yes. And she was assigned to the Publicity Committee, to work with them during the strike.

Q. Did she work with Henry Schmidt?

A. No. She worked with Ralph Mallon, and he made the motion to the Executive Board to hire her as a regular union stenographer after the strike was over.

Q. Was that done?

A. That was done. I have the minutes, I think.

Q. Did you support it?

A. I think I opposed it.

Q. In any event, she became Secretary?

A. Yes, she became one of the Secretaries. There was others.

Q. Who were the others?

A. I can't think of the girls' names, a couple of girls there, one, at least—and I can't think of them now.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. During this period of time you were on speaking terms with Sam Darcy?

A. Oh, yes; sure.

Q. Did Sam Darcy ever speak to you about Norma Perry? A. Not that I recall.

Q. Can you try to recall?

A. I don't recall any specific conversation about her. [6069]

Q. Well, not a specific one, but maybe you can recall a general one.

A. No. It is pretty hard to recall general conversations that far back.

Q. And you want your testimony to be that Sam Darcy never spoke to you about Norma Perry at any time?

Mr. Gladstein: I object to that as a misstatement of the evidence.

Presiding Inspector: You have got that once. Why ask it again?

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you speak at the Dreamland Auditorium on July 5, 1935, here in San Francisco?

A. Dreamland Auditorium?

Q. Yes. A. July 5, 1935?

Q. Yes.

A. I am pretty sure I did. That was another meeting when I gave Lundeberg a big build-up, even though I was supposed to be against him.

Q. Who was on the speakers' platform at that time?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I remember Lundeberg, and that is about all. I think there was also a member of the Masters, Mates and Pilots, a Captain Lawberg — L-a-w-b-e-r-g — that is the only two. I am not sure about the latter. I am positive [6070] Lundeberg was there. I went up there with him and introduced and spoke in his behalf, as well as my own.

Q. Was Henry Schmidt there?

A. Undoubtedly he would be.

Q. Was Louis Weinstock there?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. You are sure that Henry Schmidt was there?

A. I am not sure as to that. Knowing the type of meeting the chances are 99 out of 100 Schmidt would be there.

Q. Now, on your direct examination you testified that you spoke at Manhattan Opera House?

A. In 1935?

Q. 1935? A. Yes.

Q. When was that, in July?

A. July 1935.

Q. And under whose auspices was that meeting in the Manhattan Opera House?

A. I am not sure. It was either the A F of L Trade Union Committee for Unemployment Insurance, or the A F of L Trade Union Committee for something else. I am not sure what the name was. It was one of those two.

Q. Was it the American Federation of Labor Committee on Unemployment Insurance and Relief? A. I think it might have been. [6071]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Who was the Chairman of that Committee, or President? A. I am not sure.

Q. You know Louis Weinstock, don't you?

A. I know Louis Weinstock; yes.

Q. Was he there?

A. Yes; he was at that meeting. He was either the Chairman or the speaker.

Q. He was on the speakers' platform?

A. He was either Chairman or a speaker.

Q. You know that Weinstock is a member of the Communist Party, don't you?

A. I know nothing of the kind; and if he was for unemployment insurance I didn't care either. I recall the circumstances there well.

Q. Even though it was called the American Federation of Labor Committee on Unemployment Insurance and Relief you know that it wasn't an A F of L Committee at all?

A. I know nothing of the kind. I know it was.

Q. Huh? A. I know it was.

Q. Wasn't the matter litigated in a Federal Court? A. Not that I know of.

Q. With the Trade Commission?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Weren't they compelled to drop the name "American [6072] Federation of Labor?"

A. It might have been one of those technical cases where the American Federation of Labor refused to allow any member of the American Federation of Labor to use the name. That has happened dozens of times.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Well, you were served with a summons in that case, weren't you? A. I never was.

Q. Huh? A. Not that I remember.

Q. You don't remember the incident now?

A. Not at all. If I was served with a summons I didn't do anything about it.

Q. Weren't you also served with a notice to cease and desist?

A. Certainly not that I remember. I remember instances like that.

Q. With reference to this particular Committee? A. No, not that I recall.

Q. Would the records refresh your memory?

A. They might. I remember a case like that, but I don't think it was in connection with what you are referring to. I thought it was in connection with some publication.

Q. Well, now, as a matter of fact, you recall that you got two notices, one a notice to cease and desist and the other [6073] a notice to appear at a hearing?

A. Well, I don't recall. I recall receiving such a notice—yes, it would be a cease and desist notice—but I don't think it was in connection with this case. It might have been, I know that that was the basis of it, that it was an order to cease using the name of the American Federation of Labor without the American Federation of Labor's permission. But it seems to me that suit was brought, or that, whatever you call it, was brought by Paul Scharrenberg.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Wasn't that done because that group there was a Communist organization?

A. No, not the case I am referring to. It was done by the leaders of the American Federation of Labor, who were opposing unemployment insurance at that time, and there was a movement amongst the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor to support the bill in Congress at that time asking for unemployment insurance.

Q. And not a movement by the Communist Party?

A. I think the Communist Party was of the same mind, but the Committee I refer to was composed of A F of L local unions and union officials.

Q. Who were also members of the Communist Party? A. I don't believe it.

Q. You don't believe that Louis Weinstock is a member of the Communist Party? [6074]

A. No.

Q. Huh? A. Why should I?

Q. And a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party?

A. Why should I believe that?

Q. Huh?

A. Why should I believe that? I have no recollection of him telling me he was.

Q. Wasn't this Louis Weinstock on the speakers' stand there in the Madison Square Garden meeting in December 1936?

A. He was either the Chairman of the meeting or one of the speakers of the evening.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was he connected with the American Federation of Labor at that time?

A. I am sure he was; either a member of a local union or in some official capacity. I know later on he was Chairman of the New York Council of Painters, and they gave him credit for cleaning out all the racketeers out of the movement and giving it back to the rank and file.

Q. Was Roy Hudson on the speakers' platform at the Madison Square Garden meeting?

A. I don't think so. What meeting?

Q. What?

A. The Madison Square Garden meeting, do you say? [6075]

Q. Yes. A. Not that I remember.

Presiding Inspector: You mean the Madison Square Garden meeting?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. Not the Manhattan Opera House.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Vito Marcantonio there?

A. He spoke.

Q. He spoke?

A. Marcantonio was one of the speakers of the evening.

Q. Now, you know Bill Schneidermann, don't you? A. Yes.

Q. When did you first meet Bill Schneidermann? A. 1936.

Q. And where did you meet him?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I can't quite recall where.

Q. Under what circumstances?

A. I don't remember that either.

Q. When?

A. I have a hazy recollection it was in connection with the Presidential Election at that time, or some political movement at that time. I don't recall where I met him. He might have come down to see me in my office.

Q. Could that have been the time you were introduced to [6076] Earl Browder at Dreamland Auditorium?

A. It might have been; I don't remember.

Q. Who introduced you to Earl Browder?

A. It was either Schneidermann or Lambert, if I remember.

Q. Was it Elmer Hanoff?

A. Might have been Hanoff. They were all up there. I went up to the meeting, and Browder was speaking and I remember I asked one of them to introduce me.

Q. Did you ask either Elmer Hanoff or Schneidermann?

A. It might have been Schneidermann, Hanoff or Lambert, but I don't recall now.

Q. So you knew Schneidermann before that meeting? A. I think so.

Q. Can you tell me the circumstances under which you met Schneidermann?

A. No. I can recall some of these things, but I can't recall all those little incidents.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Well, now, go back a little while—is it possible that you could have met Schneidermann at 121 Haight Street? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. I am sure of that. I can tell you why.

[6077]

Q. And did anybody introduce you to Schneidermann?

A. I don't recall it, but I assume that that's how I would meet him.

Q. You don't recall anything about how or when or where or under what circumstances you met Schneidermann?

A. I seem to have a recollection that I met Schneidermann in '36 around election time, about the middle or right after the middle of 1936.

Q. Who was Schneidermann at that time?

A. Schneidermann took Darcy's place in the Communist Party, whatever the official office was, whether it is the District Secretary or State Secretary or State Organizer.

Q. Of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. And how many times did you meet with Schneidermann after that, after you first met him?

A. You mean up to now?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, I don't know; ten or a dozen times.

Q. At the most?

A. Oh, it might be more, it might be less. It might be a few more times. I couldn't say with certainty.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And where did you meet him?

A. Generally come down to my office.

Q. Schneidermann would come down to your office? [6078] A. Yes.

Q. Was Schneidermann ever a member of any union?

A. I don't know. I don't know.

Q. Did he come down to your office?

A. I think he was. I think, if he isn't now, or hasn't been recently, he was a pretty prominent member, I believe, at one time.

Q. Well, did he ever come down to your office as a member of a union?

A. A. No. Always came down as a member of the Communist Party, as far as I recall.

Q. And would he be alone when he would come down to your office?

A. No. Maybe sometimes he might have somebody with him.

Q. Who?

A. Well, I recall a couple of times he came down with Lambert, for example.

Q. Walter Lambert? A. Yes.

Q. Anyone else?

A. I can't remember off-hand, not that I recall.

Q. And how many times did he come down to your office? A. How many?

Mr. Gladstein: It has been asked and answered, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. [6079]

Mr. Del Guercio: Has it? I don't recall.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: He has told you how many times he met him.

A. (Continuing) Well, practically all the meetings would be in my office.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. All of them?

A. Yes. I don't recall seeing him eslewhere, except on occasions like, well, there would be the occasion of the meeting when Browder spoke and I have seen him at other public functions.

Q. And how long would he remain in your office?

A. How long would he remain in my office?

Q. Yes.

A. That would depend. Maybe five or ten minutes, maybe half an hour.

Q. Maybe two hours?

A. I can't recall any occasion where he'd stay that long, or have any reason to stay that long.

Q. Were there any meetings at your office in which anybody else was present other than Schneidermann and Walter Lambert?

A. Meetings? Do you mean while they were present?

Q. Yes.

A. Would there be anybody else there? [6080]

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. There would be other people coming in and going out.

Q. Would they be there the entire time that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Schneidermann and Lambert would be in your office? A. No.

Q. Was O'Neil ever present at a time when Schneidermann came in to your office?

A. Yes. I think that O'Neil would come in and out, but he wouldn't sit down and participate in the discussion. My office——

Q. (Interposing) What discussions did you have with Schneidermann and Walter Lambert?

A. Generally it was on something that they wanted support on.

Q. "They", you mean——

A. (Interposing) Schneidermann or Lambert representing the Communist Party.

Q. Wanted your support?

A. Or some question that might involve certain activities I can't specifically recall some of them to mind, but if I do a little thinking about it I will be able to.

Q. Well, let me help you do a little thinking. When they would discuss with you about wanting your support for the Communist Party, what matters would they want your support on? [6081]

A. It might be a lot of matters. It might be a matter of some of them in trouble.

Q. Some of who in trouble? Some of the Communist Party members in trouble?

A. Some of the Communist Party members in trouble in some legal way and they would want support, pledges of support. It might be a political question.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. If it was a political question what would they want you to do? A. Support them.

Q. Support the Communist Party?

A. Or some individuals or some individual that the Communist Party was supporting who might not be a Communist.

Q. And they would talk these things over with you and you would come to some kind of and understanding? A. Yes.

Q. How many times did Schneidermann come there to your office offering the support of the Communist Party in your activities?

A. Oh, I don't know if you could put it that way.

Q. Would you say 50-50?

A. Would you say offering the support of the Communist Party to who?

Q. To your activities.

A. To my activities? Well, it all depends on what my activities were. You see, he might come down and offer his [6082] support in our activities; for example, in supporting certain political people in office. That wouldn't exactly be "my activities". That would be the activities of the organizations that we represented on behalf of certain groups or certain individuals.

Q. Tell me about those circumstances.

A. I would say the election of Governor Olson, Ellis Patterson and Sheridan Downey would be one meeting.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And Schneidermann came down and asked you to support them?

A. They were supported.

Q. You were an Alien then? A. Yes.

Q. Schneidermann was an Alien?

A. I thought he was a citizen.

Q. Well, he is an Alien now?

A. Oh, yes. I think——

Mrs. King: (Interposing) If your Honor please, that is immaterial and something not within this witness' knowledge.

Presiding Inspector: Then he can say so.

A. (Continuing) Well, I think the present case is in Court.

Presiding Inspector: You don't have to give an opinion on a legal case. [6083]

The Witness: It is not an opinion. I didn't know his case had been decided.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Hadn't you heard that the Circuit Court had rendered a decision upholding the cancellation of Schneidermann's citizenship upon the ground that it had been procured by fraud? A. No.

Presiding Inspector: What difference does all this make? We are not trying Mr. Schneidermann.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, we won't argue the matter.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see that it is material. If it is you may have it, but I don't see how it is material.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, what else would he ask for your support on? A. Other political matters?

Q. What other political matters?

A. Well, there were other political contests. There were certain matters pending in the legislature that they might, and definitely did, think might be harmful to them and to us also, and, therefore, we would have a common ground to fight the things on through our various organizations.

Q. You and the Communist Party had a common ground on these matters?

A. That's true. There are many matters, legislative matters that the Communist Party opposes that we oppose. [6084]

Q. And then in those matters, after these meetings with Schneidermann, you would support Schneidermann and Schneidermann would support you, Schneidermann representing the Communist Party?

A. It wasn't a question of supporting me. It was a question of the issues involved as to whether the Communist Party as an organization would use what weight or what votes or what influence they had against certain things. I can name them if you wish.

Q. Now, how many times did Schneidermann talk to you about your trade union activities in these meetings?

A. It is pretty hard to separate trade union

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

activities from the general subject under discussion.

Q. Well, will you try to as best you can?

A. No, I can't.

Q. Huh?

A. I can't. I know a little about trade union activities, but if you can separate them I can't. I can't separate them from political activities of a trade union. Impossible.

Q. You mean you are unable to separate trade union activities from Communist Trade Union activities? Is that what you are saying?

A. I can do that. That is not the question.

Q. Will you do that as far as Schneidermann is con- [6085] cerned?

Mr. Gladstein: I submit that that is immaterial. I object to it, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Well, if the witness understands. I don't understand, but if the witness does he may answer. I will overrule the objection.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What Communist activities did Schneidermann ask you to follow in your trade union activities? A. I never said that.

Q. Huh?

A. I said that the conferences and the discussions were in connection with certain matters that originated either from our side or from the Communist side, and we had a mutual reason to either support or oppose such things. Now, it didn't necessarily mean that they were my activities or trade

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

union activities or Communist activities or any other political party's.

Q. In so far as you were concerned, your activities and the activities of the union, you w epresenting in these conferences, and meet ags those activities? A. That's right.

Q. And Schneidermann was representing the Communist Party?

A. That's right. I think the best thing to do would be—— [6086]

Q. (Interposing): When did you first meet Morris Rapport?

A. During the 1937 ILA convention.

Q. Where was that? A. Seattle.

Q. And who was Morris Rapport?

A. He was the head of the Communist Party in either Washington or the Northwest or in Seattle.

Q. And was he a trade union man?

A. Was he a what?

Q. Trade union man at that time?

A. I don't know. I think he was a carpenter or something, but I am not sure.

Q. Did you meet him as an official or representative of a trade union?

A. I met him as the official of the Communist Party. That's the way he was introduced to me.

Q. And who introduced you to Morris Rapport?

A. I don't recall that; either one of the delegates or somebody in the convention one day. The convention was open to the public. He was in the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

galleries, and I forget who done the actual introducing.

Q. Did Morris Rapport participate in the convention? A. No, merely a spectator.

Q. You have testified, I believe, that you were present [6087] at a meeting with Morris Rapport?

A. I didn't hear you.

Q. You testified on direct examination that you were in a meeting with Morris Rapport during the time of this convention?

A. I testified I went to a meeting in the Gowman Hotel where there was a discussion going on and he was there.

Q. Morris Rapport was there?

A. Oh, yes. I recall that very distinctly.

Q. Who invited Morris Rapport to this meeting at the Gowman Hotel? A. I don't know.

Q. Who invited you?

A. I don't think I was invited.

Q. Did you call the meeting?

A. No. I just heard that there was a gathering of warehousemen over there, that they were discussing the warehouse situation and the CIO situation and we barged in.

Q. Was Morris Rapport a warehouseman?

A. No. I'm sure he wasn't.

Q. Was he a CIO man?

A. No. I'm sure he wasn't. You mean affiliated or a member of?

Q. A member of or affiliated with the CIO.

A. No; I'm sure he wasn't. He was a CIO sup-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

porter may- [6088] be, but I'm sure that he was not a member, not at that time.

Q. He was a CIO supporter? A. What?

Q. You say he was a CIO supporter?

A. Yes.

Q. And you have known Morris Rapport continuously since? A. Yes, that's true.

Q. How many times have you met with Morris Rapport since that first meeting?

A. Oh, less than half a dozen times, I think; half a dozen or less.

Q. Now, Elmer Hanoff, where did you meet Elmer Hanoff? A. I met Hanoff in '34.

Q. Before or during the 1934 strike?

A. During the strike.

Q. And who was Elmer Hanoff?

A. I don't know what his position was. I know him as an official or he was connected with the Communist Party. I don't know what his position was.

Q. Could he have been the District Organizer of the Communist Party?

A. He might have been.

Q. And who introduced you to Elmer Hanoff?

A. I think Hanoff—my recollection is that Hanoff [6089] came down to strike headquarters with Ross and Darcy.

Q. Sam Darcy?

A. Sam Darcy, on the offer of printing the free bulletin for us.

Q. Let's see. This Strike Committee also had a Publicity Committee at that time? A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Who was on that Committee, the Publicity Committee?

A. I think Schmidt was one. Schmidt was one, Ralph Mallon was the Chairman. That's the only two that I recall now.

Q. And how many times did you meet with Elmer Hanoff after you met him in 1934?

Presiding Inspector: I have difficulty in hearing.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: I have difficulty in hearing.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you have difficulty in hearing?

A. I didn't hear that one.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't either.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will try to speak a little louder.

Presiding Inspector: You drop your voice.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. How many times did you meet with Elmer Hanoff after the first meeting?

A. I have no recollection. [6090]

Presiding Inspector: "After the first meeting"?

Mr. Del Guercio: After the first meeting.

Presiding Inspector: Oh.

A. (Continuing): I have no recollection of meeting with Hanoff after that first meeting. If I met with him it was casual and very few in number.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Not official meetings?

A. Not that I recall at any time.

Q. Now, Walter Lambert, when did you first meet Walter Lambert?

A. I met Lambert in 1933 at the Labor Council, San Francisco.

Q. Were you a delegate to the San Francisco Labor Council at that time? A. Yes.

Q. 1933? A. Yes.

Q. Was Lambert in 1933?

A. I think he was. Let me see. No, I don't think he was a delegate. I remember the circumstances of how he was up there and how I met him.

Q. And who was Walter Lambert?

A. Who is he now?

Q. Who was he then and who is he now?

A. He was just somebody who had been beaten up in a [6091] picket line at that time to me.

Q. Who is he now?

A. Oh, he is an official of the Communist Party, so far as I know. I haven't seen him for quite a while.

Q. Didn't you testify at the last hearing that you knew that Lambert had more to do with trade union affairs from your own experience than possibly anybody else you had run into?

A. That's true.

Q. And that your contacts with Walter Lambert had been more than with anyone else?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That's true.

Q. Now, do you know Alex Noral?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first meet Alex Noral?

A. 1933.

Q. Where?

A. Oh, he was running a vacant lot up in the Skid Row.

Q. And was he a member of the Communist Party at that time? A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know now?

A. I think he is.

Q. When did you first learn that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know. I am pretty hazy on Noral. I don't [6092] know. All I have got is an impression. I don't recall specifically knowing it in any way.

Q. Well, you knew him at the time he was President of the Workers Alliance of the State of California — A. Yes, sure.

Q. When was that?

A. That was mostly through '36, '37, I think, and '38; '37 and '38.

Q. And didn't you testify at the last hearing that you had frequent dealings with Noral as a member of the National Unemployment Committee of the CIO? A. Yes, true.

Q. And didn't Noral assist you in the Matson strike that you have testified to?

A. What strike?

Q. The Matson strike?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That's when I first met Noral.

Q. You knew him well then, didn't you?

A. I did not. I met him for the first time.

Q. Now, Lawrence Ross, you know him, don't you? A. Yes.

Q. Who is he?

A. He was the Editor of the Western Worker.

Q. And a functionary of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? [6093] A. Maybe.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing that you knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. You do know that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Oh, you said a "member." I thought the question was, "Was he a functionary"?

Q. Member or functionary.

A. Well, what's a "functionary"?

Q. You tell me.

A. I don't know. You tell me.

Q. Wasn't he the leader of the Communist Party delegation that proposed to your Strike Committee acceptance of the assistance of the Western Worker?

A. He was one of them. I don't know if he was the leader. It is just a logical conclusion on my part, so long as he was the editor of the paper, that he might naturally be the leader of the delegation.

Q. Do you know of anybody connected with the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Western Worker who was not a member of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know enough people connected with the Western Worker.

Q. Do you know Ida Rothstein?

A. Yes. [6094]

Q. Do you know her to be a member of the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. When did you first meet Ida Rothstein?

A. I met Ida Rothstein around the same time, very early. Pretty hazy about her. I think I met Ida Rothstein around the same time in 1933 or later. She was—I met her in connection with the unemployed movement, I think.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing that Ida Rothstein was a Communist and that she was active in the unemployed councils during 1933, '34 and '35? A. I might have.

Q. Was that testimony true? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Jim Branch? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well, I always took him for one. He used to speak—my recollection is that he used to speak on behalf of the Communist Party.

Q. Betty Gannett, G-a-n-n-e-t-t?

A. No, I don't recall meeting her very well. I think I have met her, but I can't connect it up with anything in my mind that gives me any idea of how I met her, where I met her, what she looks like or

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

anything like that. The name seems [6095] familiar. I think I have met her.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing that you did know Betty Gannett?

A. I might have. I am sure that I couldn't have testified that I knew her very well.

Q. Was that testimony true, that you did know her?

A. Well, I am saying that I know it now.

Presiding Inspector: That does not prove that he did testify to that. He says he might have.

The Witness: I think I testified that I knew her and I testified that I didn't know her very well, and I couldn't recall where I met her.

Presiding Inspector: That is more definite.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: That is more definite.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing that you knew that she was a member of the Communist Party?

A. I am not sure. I might have.

Q. Were you asked this question:——

A. (Interposing): That's my impression now: That wherever I met her I met her as a member of the Communist Party.

Q. Were you asked this question at the last hearing:

"Do you know whether she," referring to Betty Gannett, "is a member of the Communist Party?" and did you answer "She is"? [6096]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Possibly. That's my impression.

Q. Well, I will show you the transcript of the previous testimony.

Presiding Inspector: He says that is his belief now.

Mr. Del Guercio: What?

Presiding Inspector: He says that is his belief now. He has admitted it.

I take it that is correct?

The Witness: That is correct, yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Following that were you asked this question: "How do you know that?" and did you reply "Well, she told me"?

A. I don't know. If I said it then, my memory is a little better than it is now. It is two years later.

Q. Did you so testify at the last hearing?

A. I possibly did. The only recollection I have got of Betty Gannett now is that I have met her seldom. I don't even recall when and under what circumstances, and my testimony was the same——

Q. (Interposing): Do you have available the transcript of your deportation proceedings in the last hearing?

Mr. Gladstein: You know that the witness doesn't have that in his pocket. There are volumes of transcript. If you [6097] are going to read something, go ahead and read it. We don't think that you are going to misread the record.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't know what you are thinking.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I have here the transcript of the deportation proceedings against you in 1939 and your testimony of August 2, 1939. I am reading from page 2581:

"Q. Do you remember Betty Gannett?

"A. Betty Gannett, yes.

"Q. Do you know whether she is a member of the Communist Party? A. She is.

"Q. How do you know that?

"A. Well, she told me.

"Q. Do you remember when you first met Betty Gannett? A. Very recently.

"Q. When, for instance? About when?

"A. Well, it"—that should be "I", I suppose—"I think some time last year; some time during the election campaign; prior to the election campaign.

"Q. In November? A. Pardon me?

"Q. In November?

"A. No. I think maybe a little before that."

[6098]

Did you so testify at the last hearing?

A. I did.

Q. Was that testimony true?

A. Yes. You'll find more of it there where I was unable to remember what she looked like or the circumstances or anything else. I had met her recently, apparently, and I still had the recollection. It was so incidental that I don't remember it now.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you know Walter Stack?

A. Very well.

Q. When did you meet Walter Stack?

A. I think in 1934 for the first time. I wouldn't be too sure. It might have been earlier.

Q. And under what circumstances did you meet Walter Stack in 1934 or earlier?

A. Either as a member of the Marine Workers Industrial Union or as a member of the Marine Firemen.

Q. Do you know if Walter Stack is and was a Communist? A. Oh, yes.

Q. And was he also called "Ed" Stack?

A. I never heard him called that.

Q. I believe you testified that Walter Stack might have been connected with the Marine Workers Industrial Union at the time you met him?

A. He might have been. My impression is that he was. [6099]

Q. Was he with Harry Jackson at the time you met him?

A. I don't know. He might have been.

Q. Who introduced you to Walter Stack?

A. I can't remember that.

Q Did you meet him at a meeting?

A. Possibly did. I think he was on the Northwest Strike Committee or he was on the Seamen's Strike Committee in the Northwest.

Q. Prior to 1934?

A. No, during 1934.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was there any strike going on in 1933 in the Northwest?

A. Quite a few here and there.

Q. Was Walter Stack down here in San Francisco or in the Northwest in 1933?

A. My impression is that I met him in San Francisco.

Q. Was there a Local of the Marine Workers Industrial Union in the Northwest anywhere?

A. They had Locals in every port.

Q. And how many times did you meet with Walter Stack after you first met him?

A. How many times have I up to now?

Q. Yes.

A. That would be too numerous to mention. He's an official of the Marine Firemen. He is an official now and he [6100] has been an official and delegate—he has been an official of this, that and the other thing. He has been a delegate of this, that and the other convention or conference.

Q. Do you remember if he had ever withdrawn as a member of the Communist Party?

A. I am sure he hasn't.

Q. He still is? A. Yes.

Q. An admitted Communist? A. Yes.

Q. He is one of the so-called few labor leaders who openly admit their Communist connections?

A. He admits that he is a Communist, and apparently he makes a good labor leader because he keeps on getting elected by his membership. They don't seem to mind it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you support him?

A. Certainly I support him. He has always appeared to me to be a good trade union leader and a good union man.

Q. Has Walter Stack asked for your support?

A. It is not a question of whether he asks for it or not. He would get it anyway.

Q. Has he, that you recall?

A. Not that I recall. He knows that I would support a good unionist without being asked. [6101]

Q. Would you also support a good Communist?

A. Not if he is a bad unionist, I won't.

Q. Do you know Dave Saunders? A. Yes.

Q. Is he also a Communist?

A. I don't know. I don't think he is.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing that you knew that he was a Communist?

A. I don't know. I don't think I did. I think I said I "believed" he might me.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing regarding Saunders as follows: "I know that Saunders—Dave Saunders is a Communist. I, of course, know the recognized official Communists outside the union movement."

That is on page 2480.

"I know we have in our Local Unions, for example, a fellow by the name of Archie Brown; we have Ben Jones. We have—off-hand, I can't think of all of them, but when I see them and know them I can recall their names."

Did you so testify at the last hearing?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes.

Q. Is that testimony true? A. Yes.

Q. Now, this Sam Telford, I believe you testified that you knew him? [6102] A. Yes.

Q. As an official of the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. Right.

Q. Is that the circumstances under which you first met him?

A. Yes. I think he was the President or the Organizer or the Secretary.

Q. Would you say that you met Sam Telford at about the same time you met Harry Jackson?

A. No, much later.

Q. Much later?

A. My recollection of Telford is not meeting him before the strike.

Q. And you knew him also to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. How many times did you meet with Sam Telford? A. How many times did——

Q. (Interposing): After your first meeting how many times did you meet with Sam Telford?

A. I can't remember that, but I had contact with Telford numerous times. He was the official of the union.

Q. Is there any official or was there any official of the Communist Party on the Pacific Coast that you did not meet [6103] or that you did not know or that you did not come in contact with?

A. Is that the question?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Yes.

A. Give me a list and I'll look them over and I'll tell you.

Q. You know them all, don't you? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. You know many more than I do.

Q. Yes, I know I do. A. That's right.

Q. Much more.

A. You give me a list and I'll look them over and tell you the ones I have met and the ones I have never met.

Q. You know Frank Spector, don't you?

A. No, I don't.

Q. You have never met Frank Spector?

A. I don't recall meeting him.

Q. Have you heard that he is a member of the Communist Party?

A. I have heard of it. I think I have read a book or something by Spector.

Q. You also read that he was made the subject of a deportation proceedings? [6104]

A. Did I know?

Q. As a member of the Communist Party?

A. No.

Q. I just happened to have handled that ten years ago, so I know. A. Pretty good!

Q. Was he an official of the ILD?

A. I don't know.

Q. Has he ever been? A. I don't know.

Q. Regarding Frank Spector did you testify as follows in the last hearing:

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

"Q. (By Mr. Shoemaker) Frank Spector?

"A. Spector? I am not sure about Spector. I think he is an official of the Communist Party."

Did you so testify? A. I think so.

Q. Was that testimony true?

A. Yes. I'm still not sure.

Q. Do you know John Brohman?

A. Who?

Q. Brohman? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Who is John Brohman?

A. Connected with the People's World at the present [6105] time.

Q. Is that the successor of the Western Worker? A. No, it's the People's World.

Q. Huh? A. The People's World.

Q. Did it succeed the Western Worker?

A. I don't know. Did it? I don't know.

Q. Do you know John Brohman to me a member of the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. When did you first meet John Brohman?

A. I can't tell that. I have met him many times. My meetings with Brohman are generally in the nature of newspaper publicity.

Q. Did he ever work on the Western Worker?

A. Did he ever work on the Western Worker?

Q. Yes? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you meet him while he was employed on the Western Worker?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Not that I remember. It's possible, if he was on the Western Worker. I can't remember all the names of the reporters on the Western Worker? [6106]

Q. You have seen him in this Court room, haven't you? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Is he here now? A. I can't see him.

Q. How many persons on the editorial staff of the Western Worker do you know?

A. How many persons?

Q. Would you say that you knew them all?

A. No, I never. I said I didn't know them and I don't yet. I don't know how many persons are on the editorial staff and I don't know how many people connected with the Western Worker that I might know might be on the editorial staff. You name them and I will tell you whether I know them.

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, I believe that I am through with the cross examination, with the reservation, however, concerning that matter that we were speaking about in chambers.

Presiding Inspector: All right.

Mr. Gladstein: Shall I go ahead with redirect?

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Gladstein.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, in your cross examination you were asked whether you had heard that the ship Cumberland had exploded. You gave an answer to

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the effect that there were [6107] strike breakers on that ship. How would that relate to the possibilities of an explosion occurring on that ship?

A. It depends on what the ship was, where she was going to, what she was carrying, and at that time it was bad enough with an experienced crew on some of those ships, because I sailed on many of them. The ship— I thought he said the Schooner Cumberland. There was a fleet of ships sailing out of Australia to South Sea ports, up to ports in the Straits Settlements, up and around Burma and around there, and the cargo they used to carry was always topped off with a load of high-test gasoline on deck in cases. And those ships used to disappear one after the other simply because the gasoline used to blow up, get on fire. The working around with the cargo used to blow them up and they were pretty tough ships to sail on, and I was on quite a few where, as soon as we hit bad weather, the first thing we used to do was to throw the gasoline overboard.

Q. Now, what difference would it make——

A. (Interposing): And with a crew of inexperienced men acting as strike breakers it is very easy to understand what would happen. The strike breakers didn't know enough to throw the gasoline overboard, and up they went.

Q. You mentioned that you are opposed to legislation against criminal syndicalism. Do you know whether the labor movement of this State or of this

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

country has ever taken any [6108] official position similar to yours or different than yours on that subject matter?

A. At every annual convention of the National A. F. of L. and the State A. F. of L. they have unanimously gone on record for the repeal of the criminal syndicalism laws.

Q. And what is the basis or reason given for that position by the A. F. of L.?

Mr. Del Guercio: We didn't object to the Alien going into this matter here, but we certainly object to going into the reasons that other organizations have given for opposition to criminal syndicalism laws.

Presiding Inspector: I think he can give his union's views, if he knows them. Is that what you asked?

Mr. Gladstein: That is what I am calling for.

Presiding Inspector: This, of course, must be based on what he knows of the members at the meetings.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

A. Well, the criminal syndicalism——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): They have made speeches on this subject, I suppose.

A. (Continuing): The criminal syndicalism laws are used to prevent organizing. They are applied in such a way that straight organizing, striking, picketing are termed as coming under the application of the C. S. Laws, and people have been sent to jail and are still being sent to jail for

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

straight [6109] trade union activities, but they have been prosecuted under the C. S. Laws. The laws have been generally applied against any type of trade unionism where they have had a chance to apply them.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is that, what you have testified to, the position of yourself or the trade union movement or both?

A. Myself, the trade union movement, both A. F. of L. and CIO.

Q. Now, during the 1934 strike was there any other publication besides the Western Worker which offered support or assistance to the strikers?

A. Yes.

Q. Which one or which ones, if any?

A. The Catholic Leader, Father York's own paper. There was an East Bay—there was an East Bay neighborhood paper. It seems to me there was one other, but I can't recall.

Q. How were these offers of assistance made by the Catholic Leader and the other newspaper you have mentioned?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that upon the ground it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that remote from the issue?

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw that and ask it this way.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein: [6110]

Q. Were the offers of these other newspapers, the two that you have mentioned, or publications, accepted by the Strike Committee?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see its relevancy.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I think that shows the factual situation, your Honor, at the time that support was accepted.

Presiding Inspector: Then we would have to go into what kind of support.

Mr. Gladstein: I mean simply the—well, that's true. I would have to bring out that they made their columns available to the union.

You see, the point I have in mind, is this: The Government has tried, in my opinion, to create the inference that the entire union, in effect, during 1934 was taking Communist support and that, therefore, for that reason and others that are offered by the Government it was a Communist strike instead of a genuine bona fide fight for trade union conditions.

I think we are entitled to show that the situation was that the strikers had very, very few opportunities to obtain assistance and that they did take those which were offered. And I think we have the right to have the record show who offered assistance and what that assistance consisted of, and whether or not the strikers rejected it or accepted it. [6111]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

If the strikers accepted aid, no matter from what source it came, that would certainly tend to refute the inference which the Government seeks to have drawn by this line of testimony.

Presiding Inspector: I think it seeks other inferences from that evidence, but it may seek the inference that you speak of. Therefore, I will take this testimony.

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, the Government did not try to leave the inference that the union was accepting Communist support. The inference—I say the "inference" is that Harry Bridges and certain of his group were members of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: I think I understand your theory, but there is a possibility of the claim being made that Mr. Gladstein suggests, and on that basis I will take this very briefly.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you have the question in mind, Mr. Bridges? A. The aid was accepted.

Mr. Del Guercio: I didn't hear the question.

Presiding Inspector: "The aid was accepted", he said.

What was the nature of the offer of assistance?

The Witness: The big difficulty of the strike was to get the real issues before the people and the public, and we had no methods of doing that. We had no money for radio time.

Presiding Inspector: They offered to print in

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

their [6112] columns such material or some material that you might offer them?

The Witness: They printed articles just as they were sent up by the union and photographs. They printed, for example—the Leader printed a double page of photographs of the shooting and the tear-gassing, and it had quite an effect on—well, at least the——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Well, they printed it anyway?

The Witness: Yes. We accepted it. It was a weekly paper. [6113]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, you were asked whether you had ever stopped at the book shop at 37 Grove Street to buy pamphlets, and when you answered that you had you were asked to look and see whether you had any of those at your home. Have you done so?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I asked him about Communist Pamphlets. I assume counsel is going to show him Communist Pamphlets.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know—it all depends on what you think are Communist Pamphlets.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you a pamphlet——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Are they to be shown to me? I understood the witness was going to give me the pamphlets.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: I gave you some telegrams and you didn't use them.

(The pamphlets referred to were passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

Mr. Del Guercio: We have no objection to their being introduced in evidence.

Mr. Gladstein: I haven't offered them yet. I intend to ask the witness about them.

By Mr. Gladstein: [6114]

Q. Mr. Bridges, here is a pamphlet put out by Bernard Shaw, rather, carrying his name. Do you recall whether you bought that at 37 Grove Street?

A. (Examining pamphlet): Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is the same book you showed me?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Put out by the Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know whether it is or not. We will offer it.

Mr. Del Guercio: No objection.

Presiding Inspector: Received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 41.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Here is one entitled "The Strike of the Dredging Fleet 1905."

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): By whom published?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: The Workers Library Publishers. It shows on its face, I take it.

A. (Examining pamphlet): This is one of them that I purchased there; yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I will offer that.

Presiding Inspector: Received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 42.)

[6115]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Here is one entitled "Burlington Dynamite Plot," published by the International Labor Defense. Did you buy that there? A. Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it.

Presiding Inspector: Received.

(The pamphlet referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 43.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you, since 1933, ever bought pamphlets or books in any of the book shops on the waterfront or elsewhere? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that. Certainly there is no question that he bought books elsewhere.

Presiding Inspector: He says he bought a great many books and is a great reader. That is all you want to convey, isn't it?

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think there is any question about that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I don't think the record shows the date when the CIO unions were suspended by the A F of L, Mr. Bridges. Do you recall that date? [6116]

Presiding Inspector: You mean those that voted to go into the CIO?

Mr. Gladstein: No. The original ten.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I think there were ten. How many were there, do you recall? A. Ten.

Q. When were they suspended?

A. I think it was late summer of 1936. I am not sure. I can check the date.

Presiding Inspector: What was their status at that time?

The Witness: The unions?

Presiding Inspector: Had they voted to go in the CIO?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: Or applied for a charter?

The Witness: No, nothing like that.

Presiding Inspector: What had been done?

The Witness: Ten national unions, of the American Federation of Labor, formed themselves into a Committee called the Committee for Industrial Organizations, as against the craft type of organization. It grew out of a resolution being passed by the 1934 and 1935 national convention of the American Federation of Labor.

This Committee of National Unions, that called

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

themselves [6117] the Committee for Industrial Organization—that is CIO—they pooled, or they each donated a certain amount of money that was to be put into organizing the mass industries on an industrial basis.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor ordered them to disband and cease their organizing.

The Committee refused to do that, taking a position that they were not organizing a dual organization, but were carrying out the action of the convention, which they were really doing. They were organizing workers into the American Federation of Labor, not into another organization.

When the A F of L Executive Council ordered them to disband, and they refused to disband and cease organizing, they were suspended by the Executive Council prior to the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor.

The suspension was protested under the constitution of the American Federation of Labor, because the Executive Council had no legal power to suspend unions.

By the suspension that automatically prevented the unions from appearing at the annual convention of the A F of L and defending themselves, or having a vote on their particular case.

The convention took place, the annual convention, and with the ten of the largest unions in the A F of L suspended, and therefore unable to vote, the decision for suspension of [6118] the A F of

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

L Executive Council was upheld and in that way became legal.

So it was not until after that that the CIO actually decided that they would go ahead and begin issuing charters; because, in addition to the ten original unions by that time other unions were being expelled or suspended from the American Federation of Labor for supporting the ten suspended unions. They also made that a crime and suspended you for that too, and in that way the CIO eventually reached a point where it had to form its own organization and grant charters to take care of the expelled and suspended unions.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You have mentioned in your testimony that you have members of your family, relatives, in Parliament in Australia. Would you give the names of them and their positions?

A. I have one.

Q. Which one at the present time?

A. I have an uncle in the Upper House in Australia.

Presiding Inspector: Commonwealth or Dominion?

The Witness: Federal Parliament; the Upper Chamber of the Federal Parliament.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know on what ticket he was elected?

A. Yes.

Q. What one? [6119]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I submit it is of no importance unless he was elected on the Communist Party ticket.

Mr. Gladstein: Let us have the answer.

Presiding Inspector: Let us have the answer. That will be all on this.

A. Elected on the non-Communist Labor ticket.

Mr. Del Guercio: A black sheep.

Mr. Gladstein: Does Mr. Del Guercio's remark appear on the record?

The Reporter: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you asking the Court or the reporter?

Mr. Gladstein: The reporter.

Presiding Inspector: He may answer.

The Reporter: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't hear it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, in discussing the IWW you used the expression "Direct action." Will you state whether that term was used by you, or whether you know it to have been used by anyone in the IWW during the time that you were in it?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being too ambiguous.

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw the question.

By Mr. Gladstein: [6120]

Q. Was that expression used, "direct action," by you in such a way as to include the idea of violence or unlawful action?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being suggestive and leading.

Presiding Inspector: He may explain what he meant by the use of that term. A. No.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. In what sense did you use the term "direct action"?

A. Well, a preference for economic action in all cases and under all circumstances as against the use of other forms of action or bargaining.

Q. Could you give some examples that will illustrate your idea of the meaning of the term "direct action"?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. It used to be the IWW philosophy that as a rule they are opposed to signing collective bargaining agreements. They first secure an understanding, or a verbal agreement in the matter of wages, hours and working conditions. If a grievance ever develops on that job they would adjust that grievance by taking direct action or economic action. That is what the term really means. Instead of, for example, once there being trouble, the matter of a strike, an understanding was reached on [6121] wages, hours and working conditions that settled the strike; and then after the strike was over and everybody was working, and some grievance came up on the job, the IWW philosophy generally was to walk off the job until the grievance

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

was settled. And in general the term "direct action" means that instead of, after you have collective bargaining established, say a contract was signed, contracts generally carry within them the machinery for adjusting disputes, and it was never the IWW philosophy to do that as a general rule.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you know of the term "direct action" ever being used by any IWW member to indicate to you anything other than direct economic action?

A. No. It was always used in that sense.

Mr. Gladstein: You have seen all these wires and telegrams—I have showed them to you.

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein handed Mr. Del Guercio the telegrams referred to.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, I show you a telegram under date of December 3, 1936, addressed to you, purporting to be sent from Boston, Massachusetts, by Thomas, Chairman of the Boston Strike Committee. Did you receive that telegram?

A. (Examining telegram): Yes.

Q. And where did you find it? [6122]

A. I found this in the files in my office; the old files.

Q. Does it relate in any way to your speaking in Boston in December of 1936? A. Yes.

Q. Will you explain in what way it does?

A. Well, this is just——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): If your Honor please, the telegram speaks for itself.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. It can be introduced in evidence.

Mr. Gladstein: I will offer it in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to it on the ground that no proper foundation has been laid for it.

Presiding Inspector: I think, in view of your examination, I will take it. You have asked about the communications and so forth. He says he received this and various telegrams.

(The telegram referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 44.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you another telegram——

Presiding Inspector: You know who the sender is?

The Witness: Yes. That was Thomas—Thomas, Chairman of the Boston Strike Committee.

Presiding Inspector: I haven't seen it. [6123]

The Witness: It says, "Chairman, Boston Strike Committee."

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you another telegram under date of December 5, 1936, addressed to you, also sent by J. J. E. Thomas, and ask you if you can identify that telegram as having to do with your speaking in Boston during December of 1936?

A. (Examining telegram): Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Where did you obtain this telegram?

A. Out of my files.

Q. Did you receive it? A. I did.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to it. I object on the ground that no proper foundation has been laid.

Presiding Inspector: May I look at it?

(The telegram referred to was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Mr. Del Guercio: These telegrams add nothing or detract nothing from the testimony.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't hear that.

Mr. Del Guercio: And clearly not on matters brought up on cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. [6124]

(The telegram referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 45.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you another telegram under date of December 5, 1936, addressed to you, purporting to come from Martin J. Flaherty, J. R. Walker and J. E. Thomas, and ask you if you can identify that? A. (Examining telegram): Yes.

Q. What is it? A. This is a telegram——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): If it is going to be introduced in evidence it will speak for itself.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you receive it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I received it.

Q. From where did you obtain it?

A. From my files.

Q. Does it relate to your speaking in Boston in December 1936? A. Very definitely.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to it.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it over your objection. [6125]

(The telegram referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 46.)

Mr. Gladstein: I have in my hand a copy of a telegram dated December 10, 1936, to Joseph Curran from Mervyn Rathborne——

Presiding Inspector: You read that into the record?

Mr. Gladstein: Part of it was read.

Mr. Del Gurecio: Yes, in connection with a question that I asked.

Mr. Gladstein: The fact that it was officially sent from the ILA, and from the address of the ILA, was not read by Mr. Del Guercio, and I think, under those circumstances, that I would like to offer this in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Do I understand you to say that Rathborne was connected with the ILA?

Mr. Gladstein: This was charged to the ILA.

Mr. Del Guercio: Wath Rathborne connected with the ILA?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: Mr. Rathborne, as I understand from Mr. Bridges' testimony, was the Secretary of the Maritime Federation of the District of which the ILA was a member.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

(The radiogram referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 47.)

The Witness: He sent it for me, is what I said. [6126]

Presiding Inspector: Wait until the question is asked.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Referring to the July 1935 meeting at the Manhattan Opera House, Mr. Bridges, what kind of a meeting was that?

Mr. Del Guercio: That has already been gone into, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: Only on cross examination and to a very limited extent.

Presiding Inspector: Pardon?

Mr. Gladstein: Only through cross examination and to a very limited extent, which did not bring out the character of the meeting, and whether it was an open meeting, a mass meeting, or a public or secret meeting.

Mr. Del Guercio: Maybe the witness didn't know.

Presiding Inspector: As it was only brought

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

out to some extent by the Government I will take it as redirect.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Were you present at that meeting?

A. I spoke at it.

Q. What kind of a meeting was it?

A. It was a public mass meeting.

Q. How many people attended, do you know?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that. What difference does it make? [6127]

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. A large number—I wouldn't know exactly—but the place was pretty full.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What were the subjects discussed, do you recall?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I think you went into it. I think it is repetition.

Mr. Del Guercio: Only by whom it was called; not as to what was said there, or who said it.

Presiding Inspector: You asked what was the object of the meeting and he stated in relation to unemployment insurance, or something of that kind. I will take it in view of the fact that the door was opened.

A. The meeting was called by this committee, who was supporting and advocating the passage of legislation for unemployment insurance, and who called themselves the American Federation of Labor Committee on Unemployment Insurance.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was there a division of the American Federation of Labor at that time as to whether or not trade unions should support the idea of obtaining legislation for Unemployment Insurance?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being immaterial. [6128]

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. There was.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was that division?

A. Many of the official leaders—I know the President of the American Federation of Labor at that time—and other official leaders were opposed to the idea of unemployment insurance, claiming that it would in some way injure unions; and they were opposed to legislation of this nature. Therefore, the unions and individuals, and individual members of the rank and file, formed this Committee in defiance of the leaders, such leaders as I have mentioned—they were not all that way—in defiance of the leaders to advocate and support the passage of such legislation. And this committee was under the auspices of that particular Committee.

I can distinctly recall, for example, that the Printers Council of New York—or New Jersey, I think it was—and the Chairman of that Council was present at the meeting and also spoke, a man named Brown.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Is that all on that subject?

Mr. Gladstein: I think so.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a recess.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 P.M. a recess was taken until 2:00 P.M. of the same date.) [6129]

After Recess
2:00 o'clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: We are all ready.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, your Honor.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:

Redirect Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, going to the '34 Strike, will you state just when you began to advocate that workers join the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and which workers your advocacy pertained to?

Mr. Del Guercio: That is a compound question, your Honor. I think it ought to be split.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I have heard many compound questions which we didn't object to in order to save time, but I am willing to do so, your Honor.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When did you begin for the first time to ad-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

vocate that any workers join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. After the strike started in May '34.

Q. What workers did you believe should join the Marine Workers Industrial Union? [6130]

A. Seamen at that time.

Q. Did you ever, or have you ever taken the position that longshoremen should join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. At no time. They were—well, of course, there were a lot of circumstances surrounding it; but the longshoremen were already organized when the strike broke out. The——

Q. (Interposing) Did you ever——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) He hasn't finished his answer.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you finished?

A. The longshoremen were already organized. The Marine workers were trying to organize longshoremen, oh, I think, beginning around 1932, but didn't get anywhere, and it was always opposed, and the longshoremen eventually organized themselves into the ILA.

Q. Did you ever advocate that longshoremen join or become affiliated with the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. At no time.

Q. Now, when did you—withdraw that. You say that you advocated the seamen joining the Marine Workers Industrial Union shortly after the 1934 strike began, is that correct?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That is right. [6131]

Q. Prior to that advocacy on your part had you taken a different position?

A. Yes; at many times.

Q. What was your position with respect to the organization of seamen prior to the 1934 strike?

A. We were trying to have the International Seamen's Union organize jointly with us.

Q. When you say "we" to whom do you refer?

A. The longshoremen at that time in the ILA, going back to the latter part of '33 and early in 1934. I attended a meeting of the seamen in 1934 when Andrew Furuseth was speaking, the President of the Seamen's Union, and speaking from the floor I asked Andrew why the seamen couldn't organize together with the longshoremen so that we wouldn't make any more mistakes like such as always had been made in the maritime industry? And I can still remember his answer. This was prior to the 1934 strike, and on many occasions prior to that time, even going back to 1920 that I can recall, this had been quite a matter that I couldn't understand as to why the seamen and the longshoremen couldn't work together. We just changed that situation in 1934, but the leaders of the seamen at all times refused to allow their men to have anything to do with the longshoremen.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I move that the witness' answer be stricken. It isn't responsive to the ques- [6132] tion asked.

Presiding Inspector: It may not be strictly re-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

sponsive but it is on the general subject and I think it would save time to let it stand.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, what was the position of the ISU with respect to taking the unorganized seamen into their organization as at the beginning of the 1934 strike?

A. They refused to take them in and they refused to have them recognize the strike. They urged them not only to do their own work but to perform longshore work to help break our strike.

Q. What was the opinion of yourself and other leaders of the ILA during the strike with respect to the importance of having the seamen join in the strike on the side of the longshoremen?

Mr. Myron: I object to that, your Honor. It should be limited to his own opinion, not to the opinion of others.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will ask first for your own opinion on that, Mr. Bridges.

A. Well, my own opinion was in conformity with the decisions of the union and of the convention.

Q. And what were those decisions?

A. Our convention in February, 1934, passed a special [6133] resolution on it urging the organization of the seamen and the organization of seamen and longshoremen together in a federation and joint and mutual support on questions such as strikes and so forth, and, therefore, when the strike broke out

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

and the seamen were refused entrance into the Seamen's union, I'm not quite sure about the other locals in the other ports in all cases, but I know in the Port of San Francisco our official position, not only mine, but the official position of the union, was to urge them to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union to get them into an organization.

Q. And how would getting the seamen into an organization increase or decrease, or in any way affect the chances of the longshoremen to win that strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. We are going pretty broadly into this man's views. I will take it.

A. Well, I think the only way you could judge that is that I don't think there has been a strike won in the Marine industry without the longshoremen or seamen working together. Every other one has been lost. I know of none, and I am pretty well acquainted with the marine labor history.

Q. Now, during the 1934 strike was there a time when the seamen later found it possible to become members of the ISU? [6134]

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please; immaterial and irrelevant.

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw the question and put it this way.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. After the time when you urged seamen to go

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

into the Marine Workers Industrial Union did the position change?

A. Yes, there was reasons.

Q. Well, how did it change?

A. Both the MWIU and the Seamen's Union were recognized by the President's Board. Both were given audience before the President's Board and both put forward demands before the President's Board, and then the issue come up as to which union truly represented the seamen. And it was decided that an election would be held, and the election was eventually held. However, prior to that time many of the seamen deserted the MWIU and joined the ISU, who by that time had agreed to take them in, and they were taken in as probationary pledge-card members. They were not admitted to full membership. They were given pledge-cards for the purposes of voting as to which union would represent them.

Presiding Inspector: When was that?

The Witness: That was in the hearings right here in this court room, before the President's Arbitration Board, July 9, 1934. [6135]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did your position as to whether seamen should go into or remain members of the Marine Workers Industrial Union change as of that date?

A. Providing the Seamen's Union would accept them without any discrimination, and when the Seamen's Union finally agreed to do that we urged the seamen to join the ISU of A.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. When you say "we" to whom do you refer?

A. I mean myself and other members and officials of the Union.

Q. Which union? A. Longshoremen.

You have got to understand that for many, many months after the strike——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Is this in answer to a question——

The Witness: (Interposing) Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: The same question?

The Witness: He asked me what I meant by "we".

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. If you want to finish your answer you may do so.

A. The seamen never had an organization until some eight or ten months after the strike ended. They went into the strike with no organization. The main thing they got [6136] out of the strike was organization. That organization wasn't a stable one until around February or March, 1935.

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, what actually caused, if you know, the general strike of 1934 to take place?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I will object to that. It has already been gone into a dozen times at least.

Presiding Inspector: May I hear the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Gladstein: I may say, in explanation of that,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges:)

your Honor, that on cross examination Mr. Del Guercio, by his questions, indicated a line of examination intended to show that the general strike was an idea of Mr. Roy Hudson, or the Communist Party, or both, and we intend to show what the true cause was.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that going to lead us into the justification for the strike?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think so. I am not going into the merits of the strike from the employers' point of view or from the workers' point of view, but simply what Mr. Bridges, who was involved in the strike, says was the actual cause of it.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Well, there were many things that might have caused it. I think the main thing that caused the strike was the [6137] results of the attacks on the waterfront pickets on July 5, 1934, when the men was shot and gassed, resulting in two men being killed. It was a terroristic attack.

At that time an organization known as the Industrial Association had taken over the strike for the employers and their leaders, that is, the leaders of the Association, were making various statements, saying that "for once, or this time, labor has got to be taught a real lesson and this is the time to do it," and so forth.

On July 5th there was an all-day battle on the waterfront, some 400 men being injured, shot, clubbed, gassed, and so forth, two being killed and——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) We are going into again the reason for it, and I thought that was to be excluded.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I am afraid you are going to have this whole fight brought out.

Mr. Gladstein: Just the cause of the general strike is all I am interested in.

Presiding Inspector: He said that there was injury to certain of their pickets——

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) And the death of certain of the men.

Presiding Inspector: We don't care about the merits, what they were, for the purpose of this hearing.

By Mr. Gladstein: [6138]

Q. Were the men killed members of organized labor?

A. Yes; one of them was a longshoreman. The other one was a member of the Cooks and Stewards.

Q. Do you know what the reaction among organized labor was to the events of July 5 that you have just mentioned?

Mr. Myron: I object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. The strike was a protest against the attack on the waterfront, and at that time many of the leaders of the labor movement, who had formerly refused to support the strike, woke up to the fact that the attack was also directed against them and held dangers, and therefore, the general strike took

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

hold as a protest against, not only the attack on the waterfront on July 5, but the placing of troops on the waterfront on the evening of July 5.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, when did the general strike actually begin? A. July 16.

Q. Between July 5 and July 16, Mr. Bridges, do you know whether San Francisco labor leaders, regarded as conservatives in the labor movement, changed their position as coming out in favor of a general strike? A. Some of them did.

Q. Now, are you able now to name any of the leaders of the 1934 waterfront strike? [6139]

Mr. Del Guercio: The what?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Haven't we had that?

Mr. Gladstein: No. There was reference made along this line: That Mr. Del Guercio, in his questioning, asked Mr. Bridges if he wasn't the leader. He said, "No," that there were others; and he was asked, "Was Jackson a leader?" and Mr. Bridges said "No." He asked, "Was the Communist Party the leader of the strike?" and Mr. Bridges said "No, but I can tell you the names of the leaders." But Mr. Del Guercio didn't seek those names, and I think, for the record, we should have those.

Presiding Inspector: It won't mean anything.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: If your Honor feels that way I won't go into it. It was simply to fill the record on that one point where Mr. Bridges had offered to supply this information for the record and it had not been taken; but if you regard it as unimportant——

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it amounts to anything but if you think the record ought to be filled, I will allow him to give the names.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Would you do that? [6140]

A. You say the waterfront strike—you mean the waterfront striking unions?

Presiding Inspector: 1934.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

A. (Continuing) Of course, there was, first of all, the longshoremen——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) He asked for the leaders only.

Presiding Inspector: But he is going to put these in classes.

A. (Continuing) That is right. There were the longshoremen, and the longshore strike committee, of which I was Chairman, and various other sub-Chairmen, members of the Strike Committee. There were 75 of them, and many of their names have been mentioned.

There was the seamen, broken down into three parts.

For the AF of L——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Jackson, Telford, the two that I most remember, they were for the MWIU.

For the AF of L seamen, the Sailors Union, Bill Caves was Chairman of the Strike Committee; George Larson, and a man named Silver, were two of the local officials of the Sailors Union at that time. Herbert Mills was a member of the Strike Committee, and a man named O'Brien was on their committee. There were others I can't recall right now. [6141]

For the Firemen there was John McGovern, and he was the Secretary or the ranking official of the union. I can't think of any others at this time, who was on that committee.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You mean the Committee for the Firemen?

A. I am talking now of the San Francisco Committee for Firemen.

For the Marine Cooks there was Eugene Burke, present Secretary of the Union, and a man named Carl Frietche—F-r-i-e-t-c-h-e—and he was a member of their Strike Committee and very active.

I can't remember the rest of their committee.

[6142]

Q. Were there any draft organizations represented by leaders in the strike?

A. Yes. I am giving you now the waterfront unions.

Q. Yes. Well, I am referring to unions that had any connection with the waterfront or were part of the general or Joint Strike Committee.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Sure. There was dozens of them.

Q. You remember any of the other leaders?

A. Well outside of the waterfront you should have the Machinists and the Boilermakers, the Ship Fitters, the Patternmakers. They were all concerned——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) We have been all over this.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, the only question is about names.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Can you recall the names of any of the leaders of those unions?

A. Yes. Two of the leaders are pretty active now; Harry Hook and Dillon. They were leaders then. They had their International Representative, a man named Grow—"Curley" Grow they used to call him. For the Boilermakers I think there was a man named Gabbett. I don't recall the other officers. And then I think you get away from them and [6143] you get off the waterfront. The next group would be the Teamsters.

Mr. Del Guercio: He has only asked for the waterfront, as I understand it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did the Teamsters have any direct connection with the strike on the waterfront or maritime unions?

A. They struck the waterfront. They refused to haul any goods to and from the waterfront.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Under whose leadership were they?

A. Michael Casey and John P. McLaughlin.

Q. Did the Teamsters support the longshoremen during that strike?

A. Through the entire strike. They played a very important part. Without the Teamsters the strike would have been lost.

Q. Was any of that support from Mr. Casey in the nature of personal support to you, Mr. Bridges?

A. No, I don't think so. He was very much opposed to me at that time.

Q. Did he later change his opinion and support you in any way?

A. Oh, yes. He later changed his opinion completely.

Mr. Myron: I don't know how this is material, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see how this is material. [6144] Leave that out.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, you testified yesterday that you have in the past advocated that workers read the Western Worker or the Daily Worker. Did you have reasons for that position?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, the reasons aren't important. The fact that he has advocated it is sufficient.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I think that you have——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) It would be self-serving at the best.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I know, but that wouldn't be a reason for not receiving it. I think I will take it.

A. Yes, I have.

Presiding Inspector: You have gone into his general attitude toward all these matters. In fact, you seek to draw an inference from the very fact that he advised this.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, supposing that this Alien was charged with distributing literature advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and supposing that he admitted that he did distribute such literature? Now, would the reason why he did it be important or material or relevant?

Presiding Inspector: According to the claim of the Alien it would be. [6145]

Mr. Gladstein: I would like to add something to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: It is their argument and I am not passing on the validity of that argument at present. Therefore, I think we had better have the proof as a background.

Mr. Gladstein: As a matter of fact, our theory is a good deal different from that and our theory is much more in line with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dijon case in which the Court stated, for example, in that case that a peaceful assembly for the purpose of lawful discussion could not be made criminal even though it

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

developed in the case that one or two of the people who were present at that meeting were members of the Communist Party.

Now, our position simply on the question of the Western Worker and the Daily Worker is to find out what reason there was Mr. Bridges had in suggesting to anybody that that person read it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Was the Dijon case a deportation case?

Mr. Gladstein: No, it wasn't. But I don't think that makes a great deal of difference.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think the precedent is very close, but I will take the proof.

A. (Continuing) The answer is, Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What were those reasons? [6146]

A. Well, it has always been our experience, still is——

Mr. Myron: (Interposing) Now, this is his own reason, I believe, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. Give your own reasons.

A. (Continuing): It has always been my experience and still is that you can't, or one can't, especially the working or labor people, can't expect any fair treatment from the daily newspapers. I think we see enough evidence every day of that.

Mr. Del Guercio: The witness should be confined to his own experiences.

Presiding Inspector: He is giving his own ex-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

periences. I take this as his own. He may use different pronouns, but he means his own.

That is right, isnt' it?

The Witness: Yes. I am not in the habit of saying "I", maybe.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead. Don't be afraid to say "I". Go ahead.

A. (Continuing): I think that in dealing with the problems of labor and trying to get their story before the broad mass of the people that we have a very difficult time with the ordinary, average daily newspaper, and separate and apart from the policy or certain other things advocated by such an organization as the Daily Worker or Western Worker [6147] it certainly has been my experience that they run the story of labor pretty straight as a rule. It is certain that they make mistakes and make errors at times in printing the whole story, but compared to the other newspapers, who either refuse to print any press release that a union gives them—if they print it they add an editorial completely distorting it, they twist it around and, as a matter of fact, they lie. Compared with those types of papers and a paper like the Western Worker or the Daily Worker, they would print the true facts of a labor case. And in so far as those articles are concerned, the average person can get a better idea of what a labor union is doing and what their true story is than they can by reading any of the other newspapers. And, therefore, in urging any workers to read a paper like the Western Worker or the Daily

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Worker you are not necessarily urging them to read them because of the policies or the principles set forward in the editorial policy, but merely for the news and the stories contained in the paper in regard to union activities or trade union activities or this, that or the other issue that at that time is current.

That was the only reason that I ever had in urging that workers read those papers, and my ideas haven't changed on it even yet.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I move that the entire answer be stricken as it appears to me that it is not [6148] testimony but merely a present solicitation for the subscription to the Daily Worker and the Western Worker. I suppose a motion would be improper, as it might be said to be improper, as it would tend to establish that even now the Alien here——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You are giving that——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Continuing) ——is soliciting subscriptions to Communist papers.

Presiding Inspector: I think he was giving that latter statement now to show the firmness of his belief in the correctness of the original view as stated, and I will let it stand. I don't think it will be very successful as a bid for subscriptions for the particular journals.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, you were asked whether Elaine

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Black spoke at the ILA convention in February of 1934, and you stated that you would check the records and see whether she actually spoke or not. Did you make a check of those records? A. I did.

Q. Did you find whether or not Elaine Black was a speaker? A. She didn't speak.

Mr. Myron: I assume he means by that, whatever records he checked didn't show that she spoke.

Mr. Gladstein: I suppose so. I don't suppose he could say that she didn't speak from any records he didn't check. [6149]

Mr. Del Guercio: The question was whether Elaine Black was scheduled to appear to speak.

Mr. Gladstein: Do you want to continue with your cross examination?

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you speaking to me or to the Court?

Presiding Inspector: Oh, now, let us not get into a controversy on the matter.

Mr. Del Guercio: He should address the Court.

Presiding Inspector: Even though it varies from your question I will allow it. He hasn't been able to find any records.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What records did you check?

A. Official minutes of the convention. They are verbatim.

Q. Did you find whether or not she was invited to speak or whether she asked permission to speak?

A. She was invited to speak.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And by whom was she invited, according to the records? Of course, I suppose the records are the best evidence.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think the records should be produced.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't suppose they are material exactly and I will withdraw the question. [6150]

Presiding Inspector: I will take it without the introduction of the documents. It is entirely collateral. I will allow it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know by whom she was invited to speak?

A. The minutes show that the Chairman announced that there had been a request in the form of a communication by Elaine Black herself, I think, or someone else, and that's all that deals with the invitation.

Q. What was the disposition of it?

A. I think a vote was taken and the answer was, No.

Presiding Inspector: You didn't want to hear her?

The Witness: There is no reason given in the minutes as to why they didn't want to hear her, but they didn't want to hear her. That is correct. No reasons given. It might have been because of the press of work before the convention, one thing or another.

Mr. Del Guercio: May I ask that an answer be

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

read a little way back? Maybe I was mistaken. I thought I heard the witness testify that they were verbatim minutes.

Presiding Inspector: He did say, I think, that the minutes were verbatim.

You did, didn't you?

The Witness: That's right. The minutes show "All [6151] those in favor of hearing her speak say 'Yes' ", and there was some "Yesses". "All those say 'No' ", and there were too many "Noes" and that was that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, did the question of the Waterfront Worker ever come up before the union itself, the ILA? A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. I don't remember the exact time. 1935 or early in '36.

Q. In what way did the question come up before the union?

A. Somebody got up and made a motion to donate a couple of hundred dollars to the Waterfront Worker.

Q. Did the union take any position on that motion? Or any motion to support the Waterfront Worker?

A. Once the motion was made they would have to take a position. My recollection is that—I am not sure the donation was approved or voted. I do remember that a vote of confidence was given the paper.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. That is the ILA union voted a vote of confidence to the Waterfront Workers? A. Yes.

Q. You were asked about the constitution of the ILA in 1935 and you stated that you would make a search for that [6152] and attempt to produce it here. Did you make such a search?

A. Yes, and couldn't find one.

Q. Do you recall from memory what the situation was in 1934 with respect to whether the ILA had a constitution?

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, that has been gone into.

Presiding Inspector: I think so.

Mr. Gladstein: It hasn't.

Presiding Inspector: I think that he said it had, but not a very full one.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, assuming then that that is the state of the record—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): I may be wrong, but that was my general recollection.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Assuming that that it the state of the record I will ask you, Mr. Bridges, in what state the constitution was,—that is, in what condition it was—in 1934 with respect to whether there were copies available, printed copies or whether it was in the process of being adopted?

A. I don't think there was any printed copies of the constitution available until after 1934. Pretty loose. The constitution was adopted in 1933 and there were a few mimeographed copies distributed

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

then and really no—as far as I recall, there was really no printed copies of the constitution available in final form until after 1934. [6153]

Presiding Inspector: I think that is substantially what he testified to before.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is there any office of the ILWU, either in San Francisco or elsewhere on the Pacific Coast or anywhere——

Mr. Myron (Interposing): May I get that question?

Mr. Gladstein: I haven't finished it yet.

Mr. Del Guercio: We can't hear you. You have got your hand up to your face.

Mr. Gladstein: I am falling into your habits, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't have to cover mine.

Presiding Inspector: Let us hear the question again. Do you wish the reporter to read it?

Mr. Gladstein: No.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is there any place where there could be available to you a copy of the ILA constitution in 1934?

A. I don't know. Maybe in the International Offices of the ILA or in the ILA District Offices on the Pacific Coast. The reason is that most of our ILA records were given over to the ILA after we went CIO. They sued for them and they were turned over to them. So any spare copies of constitutions and things like that that were on file in what you

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

might call my office or the office of the Secretary were turned over [6154] as a rule.

Q. Now, you were asked concerning a meeting on June 19, 1934 at which Harry Jackson was present. Do you recall that meeting?

A. Well, I was asked about a lot. I don't know exactly what meeting you refer to now. June 19, 1934? Off-hand I don't know what meeting you refer to.

Q. A public meeting, as I understand it.

A. I recall such a meeting around that time, yes.

Q. Where was it held, do you remember?

A. Civic Auditorium, San Francisco.

Q. Under whose auspices?

A. Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. What was the purpose of the meeting?

A. A public mass meeting to acquaint the people of San Francisco with the reasons that a contract—a so-called contract that had been signed by President Ryan had been repudiated by the longshoremen.

Q. Now, you stated that you recall Jackson being there.

A. I don't know at this meeting. I think that the only meeting I recall Jackson speaking at was a meeting after—the only meeting that I recall Jackson speaking at was a public meeting in the Civic Auditorium—and I don't recall any other—was a meeting after July 5, 1934.

Q. You testified that you recalled a public meet-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ing at which Jackson spoke because of a remark that he made. Do you [6155] recall that remark?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall the remark that he made?

A. If it is the meeting I mean, and this was the meeting where—I think that was in regard to the general strike being advocated—I recall one meeting and I recall one remark that he did make, yes.

Q. What was the remark?

A. Well, I just happened to remember it. His remark was, I think, that "They might call us 'Red', but they can't call us 'Yellow' ". I happen to remember that one, and later on in the Labor Council there was quite a to-do over the fact that he spoke at this meeting with the rest of us.

Q. Now, you mentioned the Agreement of June 16, 1934 that was signed by Mr. Ryan. I think you have already testified that the rank and file or the Local Unions up and down the Pacific Coast refused to accept that Agreement, is that correct?

A. That's right. It was an agreement they called the "June 16 Agreement".

Q. What was your relationship with Mr. Ryan at that time?

A. That was the first time I ever seen him.

[6156]

Q. Well, what did your relationship become as a result of your experinece with him at that time?

A. Pretty strained, I would say. Ryan came to the West Coast here, and with a lot of publicity.

Presiding Inspector: What was your relation-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ship with Mr. Ryan? I think you can answer that directly as being close, or friendly, casual, or any of those words.

Mr. Myron: He already answered. He said it was strained.

Presiding Inspector: Strained?

Mr. Myron: Strained.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Has your relationship to Mr. Ryan been different than that?

A. We got kind of friendly later on; I mean it changed a little.

Q. At what period did that occur?

A. For about three months in 1936.

Q. Can you date that period with respect to the time when, as you have testified, the International agreed to support the Pacific Coast District in the 1936 strike?

A. Yes. That would extend from about August to November or December, 1936—or September to about December, 1936.

Q. Now, when——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Are we going into all this on redirect examination? [6157]

Presiding Inspector: I don't know. New matters brought out on cross, as to those subjects there may be redirect examination.

Mr. Del Guercio: It is on a subject that has no remote connection here.

Presiding Inspector: Let's hear the next question.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When did the relationship between you and Ryan become strained again?

A. When I went back east in 1936, or just prior to that; around the beginning of December, 1936, or a little earlier.

Q. While you were back east was it possible for you to appear at any ILA union meetings?

Presiding Inspector: You asked about that?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't know as I have.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know as you have. He explained that pretty fully. I didn't suppose you cared to touch it, but you are entitled to if you want it.

Mr. Gladstein: Some things that were not brought out on cross examination.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

A. No; no, only in certain cases.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Would you explain that, please?

Mr. Del Guercio: Are we going into—— [6158]

Presiding Inspector: You went over it, and I don't suppose they would care to touch it, but they have a right to ask him again about it.

A. Well, in most of the ports of the east coast the men in the union, they don't just have any union meetings. There are some exceptions. The places that I went to at that time were the exceptions, where the local union leaders were not a part of the Ryan machine, and they held local union meetings

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

—the three places being Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Practically all through the entire port of New York, for example, union meetings of the longshoremen are unheard of. The unions are gangster controlled. Something has recently been done about that particular phase of the situation there.

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you talking about Joe Curran's union?

The Witness: Oh, no. Joe Curran was one of the fellows that put a stop to that kind of thing.

Mr. Del Guercio: I must have misunderstood you.

The Witness: I am sorry. I thought you wanted the information.

I am talking about Joe Ryan, and the ILA in the Port of New York, where the District Attorney for Brooklyn recently ordered him to hold union meetings, and forced him to disband [6159] three local unions there under the domination of gangsters.

So it wasn't easy to hold union meetings of longshoremen in New York, and it is not easy now. It is more than your life is worth in some cases.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, in that 1936 strike in the east was there any close connection between the longshoremen and the seamen who were on strike?

A. There is always a close connection between longshoremen and seamen, and especially in strike periods, and there was at that time very definitely a close connection.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What was the nature of that connection?

A. Well, the support of the longshoremen would determine the success of the seamen's strike. They didn't get the support and, therefore, their strike was not a success.

Q. Would that in any account for the fact that some of the requests that you received from the east to speak in the East came from representatives of both the seamen's group and the longshore group?

Mr. Myron: I object to that as a hypothetical question.

Mr. Del Guercio: And as calling for a conclusion.

Presiding Inspector: There are objections to that question.

Mr. Gladstein: It does call for a conclusion, but I can ask him to explain the relationship. [6160]

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps that would be the best way.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Would you explain the relationship between what you have just expressed, what you have just explained, and the telegrams in evidence, which came to you during 1936 from representatives of both the seamen's and the longshore groups, jointly signed?

Mr. Myron: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. The only requests that I received from any eastern port, or the Gulf, were from those ports where the seamen and the longshoremen were work-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ing together, where the longshoremen were supporting the seamen; and where there was some measure of tried union democracy, where they were able to send such a request. And in those particular ports there was close cooperation between the seamen and the longshoremen, and we were trying to spread that cooperation—therefore, the requests.

Q. Now, you were asked about a meeting in San Francisco on July 5, 1935, a public meeting. What kind of a meeting was that?

A. I am not sure if it was a public meeting. I think it was a meeting in commemoration of July 5, 1934. It has been one of our policies to set aside July 5 in memory of the [6161] men that were killed and shot up and down the Pacific Coast in the '34 strike. Eight men were killed all told. We have generally recognized, and have held certain types of services, on July 5th.

July 5, 1935, I recall that we had all the unions participate in a demonstration, in a mass parade, winding up in the evening, or in the late afternoon, I think it was, in a meeting of the Waterfront Maritime Workers in Dreamland Auditorium. I was one of the speakers.

Q. Now, was that anything except a union meeting?

A. It was mainly a union meeting. It is possible that members of the public were there, but it would mostly be members of the maritime unions.

Q. You mentioned that Mr. Lundeberg spoke at that meeting. Do you recall that? A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And that you introduced him?

A. I introduced him as the President of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, the newly elected President.

Q. And as of that date, July 5, 1935, what did you in public say with respect to Lundeberg as to your position toward him?

A. I said we were lucky to be able to elect him President of the Maritime Federation, and believed that he would make a very good President. [6162]

We all make mistakes.

Q. Now, you mentioned that you have supported a man named Walter Stack, whom you know to be a Communist. Will you explain in what ways you have supported him and your reasons for it?

A. Oh, I supported him as long as he had a good trade union policy; and always opposed him when he had a bad one.

Q. In what ways would the question of your support for Walter Stack come up?

Mr. Myron (Interposing): "Would" come up, or "did" come up?

Mr. Gladstein: "Did".

A. It might be any matter, it might be any policy, or activity he was advocating as the best thing to do at a particular time for the——

Mr. Myron (Interposing): I object—the question was reframed to "What did occur".

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: Something specific?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: As to what did occur in that respect.

A. (Continuing): Let me see—you want a specific example?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

A. (Continuing): I very recently had—although Stack [6163] has more or less come to see it the same way—very recently had a pretty wide difference of opinion with him. On the question of affiliating, for example, the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast, Stack was opposed to it. I thought he was all wet. He might have changed his mind a little, but not completely. I think that is a good example and one of the most recent.

There have been many similar.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Were you and he in open opposition on that matter in trade union meetings?

A. Yes; very definitely.

Q. What has been your position, Mr. Bridges with respect to whether or not you will support a trade unionist if he is a Communist or—if he is a Communist?

Mr. Del Guercio: "If he is a Communist or if he is a Communist?"

Mr. Gladstein: No. I finished the question. I said "if he is a Communist."

A. The question of support only goes to whether he is a unionist or not. If he is a bad unionist, we don't care what he is, we are against him; if he is a

good one, we don't care what he is, we are for him. His first allegiance must be for the union.

Mr. Myron: I suppose when he says "we" he means "I"? [6164]

The Witness: I.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. How do you determine, how have you determined in the past, Mr. Bridges, whether a man is a good trade unionist?

A. How do you determine it?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, generally by the net results of the policies or the activities he advocates and follows. For example, if you see a person advocating a strike at the wrong time, and the strike takes place and you see the union smashed, well, I would say as a trade unionist, regardless of his political affiliation, he is lousy. We have had enough examples of that.

At the same time, take the reverse situation—if a strike is necessary, and you see a person fighting against a strike, and as a result the union is weakened or destroyed, or becomes impotent, again he is no good as a trade unionist.

It doesn't make much difference whether he is possibly sincere in his beliefs or not, it is results you must go by. The workers don't excuse you, and there is no good arguing with them that you made a mistake and didn't mean it. They want results and that is all they go by. If you don't produce them it is too bad. Therefore, when you start trying to judge people on their political philosophy, if he is

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

a trade unionist, the first thing that counts is what are you going [6165] to do for the union as a whole and what will the union get out of it. As long as a person, as far as I am concerned, as far as our entire union is concerned—and when I say "our entire union" this question comes up occasionally:——

Q. (Interposing): Has your union ever passed on this question?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, we are not interested in his union, but in his own particular beliefs.

Presiding Inspector: We have had those.

The Witness: In all matters I am bound by my union. I can't operate as a single individual. Everything I say or do——

Mr. Del Guercio: Wait until a question is asked.

The Witness: I think it is entitled to come out as to what the true facts are.

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps you had better let the Presiding Inspector rule on this.

I will take the answer.

A. (Continuing): I was just saying, it is impossible for me to do anything any more as an individual. Everything I say I have got to watch, everything I do I have got to watch. I can't do anything as an individual. It is always taken as an official position of my union, or of the CIO, or something; so that to talk in terms of personal or individual opinions is somewhat foolish in these cases. Generally, when [6166] I express an opinion, for my own protection, if nothing else, I express an

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

opinion that I well know I will be supported in by the majority in my union, or the majority of all unions that I have to represent; otherwise I would be foolish. And when I point out that there is no discrimination in our union because of political beliefs, I mean that. We have gone on record for it time and time again. And while this hearing was adjourned the matter came up in our convention and the decision in favor of no discrimination because of political beliefs was unanimous.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Has that position been previously taken in local unions, or in district conventions of the longshoremen?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor pleases, in the interests of expedition alone I think that the witness should be stopped.

Presiding Inspector: We have heard a lot about good trade unionists, and bad trade unionists, and about good Communists and bad Communists. I think we will take this, and let it stand.

The Witness: It has been settled, as I explained it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, referring to the occasions when Mr. Schneidermann, or Mr. Lambert, have come to your office and had conversations with you, what have been, to your recollection, any of [6167] the issues or matters discussed?

A. You mean specific examples?

Q. If you can think of any.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I can think of some. Separate and apart, practically any discussion like that would be——

Mr. Myron (Interposing): He has been asked what were the discussions and he is saying what would have been.

Presiding Inspector: He is saying how difficult it is for him to remember. This is a mere explanation.

Go ahead.

A. (Continuing): The only ones that I can think of were generally political matters, matters of——

Presiding Inspector: What do you mean by "political," supporting some candidate or policy?

The Witness: And other things.

First of all, at no time do I recall were trade union policies as such discussed in such conferences.

Presiding Inspector: Were political philosophies discussed,

The Witness: Political theories, yes. I have discussed that with those people, and in many cases disagreed.

For example, there would be matters discussed such as the freedom, or support in the fight for freedom of certain prisoners—Mooney and Billings, McNamara, the Scottsboro case, King-Ramsay-Connor, and the Modesto case, and many things like that; and there would be requests for support [6168] against discrimination, such as refusing halls to Communists, or Communist speakers, or Commu-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

nist political candidates; the refusal of the radio; requests for them to appear before our union meetings on behalf of this, that or the other issue; requests for support of legislative matters that might hurt, hit or hurt trade unions, and discussions along that line. In addition to supporting certain political candidates or matters.

For example—I can give examples if necessary.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Will you give any that you think of, other than what you have mentioned?

A. Well, I think the Communist Party didn't exactly like my attitude in the last election where, somewhat in the support of John L. Lewis——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): This relates to a discussion, meetings and discussions with Schneidermann long prior to this last election.

A. (Continuing): Well, I can go back even further: I can definitely remember a discussion—I am trying to place one with Schneidermann. I can remember a discussion with Schneidermann on the "Ham and Eggs" issue. We supported it. The Communist Party was against it.

I can remember many discussions, for example, on matters such as I have said, support or joint cooperation in the [6169] matter of the fight to release Mooney and Billings, McNamara, Scottsboro case, and such things as that.

Presiding Inspector: You were in general accord on those subjects?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

The Witness: Oh, yes. I can remember, definitely remember requests asking us to protest to maybe the City authorities, maybe private authorities, for the refusal of city and private authorities to rent them halls and things like that. In many cases we protested.

I can recall discussions in the C.S. cases, where they had several of their people in jail on the C.S. laws, and asking us to help them in the fight against the C.S. laws, and we were in agreement on those things.

I can recall them requesting to have speakers at certain meetings we held to speak in favor of either the Communist Party, or something connected with it.

And, as I say, I can recall various discussions requesting our cooperation, or them offering their cooperation, on certain matters, such as the support of political candidates, matters of strikes, and things like that.

Mr. Gladstein: Could I have time for a conference for a few moments? Could we take our recess?

Presiding Inspector: You want a short recess?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

[6170]

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, at this time we would like to ask leave to have Mr. Bridges withdrawn from the stand so that we can put on our next witness. We have finished our redirect exam-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ination. The reason for this request is that our next witness is an important official of the State of California whose time is rather important. Because of the uncertaintly as to when this case would end he is now available, and we would appreciate it very much if we could, in order to save his time, put him on at this time.

Presiding Inspector: How much further do you have?

Mr. Grossman: We have finished our redirect.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, you have?

Mr. Grossman: We have finished our redirect, yes.

Presiding Inspector: Then, if you will step aside,——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) I have, of course, a few questions.

Presiding Inspector: You have a right to ask them. You don't object to this?

Mr. Del Guercio: No. I don't object. I do object—I think we are all important. All our time is important and our time is to be considered, too.

Presiding Inspector: I think that is true, too.

(Witness temporarily excused.) [6171]

BENJAMIN E. MALLARY

called as a witness for and on behalf of the Alien, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your name, please?

A. My name is Benjamin E. Mallary; M-a-l-l-a-r-y. I live at 33 Overhill Road, Orinda, California.

Q. What position or positions do you hold at the present time, Mr. Mallary?

A. I am a Consultant in Personnel Training, and among my positions are at the University of California as a lecturer and member of the State Personnel Board, and I advise with several Government departments regarding personnel training.

Q. What generally—very generally and simply—are your functions in connection with the State Personnel Board?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to going into the functions if your Honor please. He has stated what his occupation is. I think that is sufficient.

Presiding Inspector: Unless his functions have brought him in contact with Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: Unless his functions have brought [6172] him in contact with Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Grossman: I will abandon that, then, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. For how long have you been connected with the State Personnel Board?

A. Two years about.

Q. And how was that connection established? By election, appointment or what?

A. By appointment of the Governor.

Q. Have you ever held any other state positions?

A. I was with the State Department of Education for about ten years.

Q. In what capacity?

A. Supervisor for the training of vocational teachers located at the University of California.

Q. Have you held any Federal positions?

A. From April, 1935 until September, '36 I was employed by the Department of Agriculture, part of that time as Assistant Director in the Resettlement Project, Region No. 12 at Amarillo, Texas.

Q. Have you held any advisory positions in connection with any governmental departments or agencies, any federal departments or agencies?

[6173]

A. Oh, several.

Q. Which federal departments or agencies?

A. Oh, the Forest Service. I mean, these were consulting capacities, usually unpaid. CCC, NYA, WPA. Those are some of the agencies.

Q. For how many years have you been working

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

in the field of personnel work or personnel administration? A. Since 1918.

Q. For how many years have you been connected with the University of California?

A. Indirectly about 13 years and directly about 5.

Q. Could you define for us very generally what personnel work consists of?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I think this is a sufficient building up.

Mr. Grosman: I am asking this question because I am getting close now to the basis of his knowledge, and I think if we define "personnel workers" its importance will be indicated.

Presiding Inspector: With that understanding I will take it. I think you have established the position of the witness.

Mr. Grossman: I want to know, though, what "personnel work" generally consists of because of the basis of his knowledge. [6174]

Presiding Inspector: If that has brought him into contact with the Alien I will allow that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state generally what personnel work consists of?

A. Primarily it consists in attempting to surround workers, whether they are in private industry or public employment, with the kind of conditions that will be conducive to them doing their work well and selecting the right man for the right

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

job and be concerned that the right men are promoted; the whole problem of the worker and his work.

Q. Do you belong to any California organization of personnel specialists?

A. California Personnel Management Association.

Q. And, generally speaking, can you describe what is the function of personnel managers?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I will object to going any further.

Mr. Grossman: This is going along the same line as coming closely to the basis of his knowledge.

Presiding Inspector: You had better get quickly to it. I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: The next question, your Honor.

A. The members of that Association are representatives of Government agencies and private employers and they are in- [6175] terested in working conditions.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What did you say was the name of this California Organization?

A. California Personnel Management Association.

Q. Did you ever have occasion in connection with the meetings or conferences of this Association to obtain any information on the reputation of Harry Bridges for truth and veracity?

A. I have.

Mr. Myron: I object to that, your Honor.

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you state what was the occasion for your receiving such informotion on the reputation of Harry Bridges for truth and verocity?

Mr. Myron: I object to this, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take this. It is a qualifying comment. He has not yet reached what his reputation is, but what opportunities the witness has had to know of his reputation among the people.

Mr. Grossman: That is right.

A. During the years 1937 and '38 and part of '39 I was a regular attendant at every one of their meetings, and at [6176] those meetings the men and women are seated around small tables, and during those table conversations that took place before the speakers we would discuss employment conditions, and at that time I received my information.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Were there present there personnel managers for various industrial establishments?

A. There were.

Q. Were there present there personnel managers for various shipping companies?

A. I believe there were.

Q. Were there present there personnel managers for various companies which have their seat of operation on the waterfront?

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

Mr. Myron: He might ask him who was there?

Presiding Inspector: I suppose he is going to do that. I will allow this question.

A. There were.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Were there present personnel managers or men doing personnel work in State and County governments? A. There were.

Q. Could you state about how many persons there were at these various meetings you spoke about? A. From 75 to 175 persons.

Q. Would it be possible for you to list the names [6177] of these persons?

A. I couldn't recall specific names.

Q. Upon the basis of what discussions were had in the meetings of this organization can you state what is the reputation of Harry Bridges for truth and veracity where he lives and works?

Mr. Myron: I will object to that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, on a number of grounds: Bringing in the question, the issue of the Alien's reputation for truth and veracity, which is not at issue at this time. It also brings in another question. I don't believe that the witness is qualified to say whether he knows——

Mrs. King: (Interposing) We can't hear you.

Mr. Del Guercio: (Continuing) ——the Alien's reputation for truth and veracity. All he has testified to so far is that he has attended a number of personnel meetings. I don't know whether these

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

people, of course, knew; where the meetings were held. They weren't held, certainly, as I get the testimony in the community in which the Alien there has lived and worked. And so on those grounds, both of those grounds——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Were there representatives of employers in San Francisco there?

The Witness: There were. [6178]

Presiding Inspector: And of citizens? A number of citizens of San Francisco?

The Witness: Oh, they were most all of them employers' representatives or employers.

Presiding Inspector: In San Francisco largely?

The Witness: About half, I should judge.

Presiding Inspector: I think he is qualified. You may test his qualifications on cross examination.

Now, so far as the testimony being competent, although I excluded this same line of testimony with the Witness Horn who was on the stand and held—and I adhere to that ruling—that mere contradictions in the evidence between statements made on the stand and statements made elsewhere do not open the door for this kind of proof, yet if the witness goes to far as to give a basis on which it could be found that there was, for example, the commission of crime or anything weighing against his general character, then I think this testimony would be competent. Under the circumstances here

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

I have decided to admit this line of testimony, so I will allow the question.

I made that statement as a general explanation of what might appear to be an inconsistent ruling.

Mr. Grossman: I will reframe the question to save time.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Are you in a position to state what was the reputation [6179] between 1937 and 1939 of Harry Bridges for truth and veracity in the places where he worked and lived? A. Excellent.

Q. Upon the basis of what you know about the reputation of Harry Bridges for truth and veracity would you believe him under oath?

A. I would.

Mr. Grossman: No more questions.

Presiding Inspector: Cross examine.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Are you an important State official?

A. Modesty declines me to——

Q. (Interposing) What?

A. Modesty makes me decline to answer.

Q. This State Personnel Board, what does it consist of?

A. They are constitutional officers. There are five members appointed for ten years. They are responsible for the administration of the State Civil Service system, about 27,000 employees.

Q. Is it a political appointment?

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

A. Well, I had to be approved by the Senate. It is certainly not of my political faith by and large.

Q. Who appointed you to the position?

A. The Governor appointed me and the Senate confirmed [6180] me.

Q. Governor Olson? A. Yes.

Q. And it wasn't at any of these meeting of the Personnel Board of the State of California that you had occasion to know the reputation of Harry Bridges here? A. Never.

Q. For truth and veracity? A. No, sir.

Q. Did his name ever come up in connection with your duties as a State officer? A. No, sir.

Q. Did the question of Harry Bridges' reputation for truth and veracity ever come up during the time you occupied advisory positions with the State and Federal Governments? A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know any members of the Communist Party? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Huh? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Have you ever asked members of the Communist Party as to what Harry Bridges' reputation for truth and veracity is?

A. Well, I wouldn't know. [6181]

Q. You wouldn't know?

A. I wouldn't know whom to ask.

Q. Huh?

A. I wouldn't know whom to ask.

Q. Would you say that a member of the Communist Party would have a good reputation for truth and veracity?

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

A. Well, I wouldn't know because I don't know much about them.

Q. Have you ever gone into the question or ever discussed the question with anybody as to whether the Alien here, Harry Bridges, was a member of the Communist Party? A. I probably have.

Q. Did that question ever come up in the meetings here of the California—what do you call it? California Personnel Management Association?

A. Never, to my knowledge.

Q. You say that there were representatives from the shipowners in those meetings. Did these representatives of the shipowners ever state in these meetings that Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party? A. I never heard any.

Q. Huh?

A. I never heard any make that statement.

Q. Did these representatives of the shipowners accuse in these meetings here Harry Bridges of ever being a member of [6182] the Communist Party?

A. I never heard one of them do so.

Q. Did they give their opinion as to the Alien's reputation for truth and veracity?

A. They did.

Q. Do you know Mervyn Rathborne?

A. No.

Q. Did he have anything to do with your appointment on the State Personnel Board?

A. I would not know.

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

Q. You say you were connected with the National Youth Administration in advisory capacity?

A. In advisory capacity.

Q. Was Mervyn Rathborne ever connected with the National Youth Administration?

A. I do not know.

Q. You also say you were connected with the WPA? A. In an advisory capacity.

Q. In what connection?

A. Oh, I advised them regarding a pamphlet they wrote down there at Washington to train WPA foremen.

Q. Were you paid? A. I was not.

Q. You say you were also employed—connected in an advisory capacity with the CCC? [6183]

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you paid? A. I was not.

Q. How long have you known Harry Bridges?

A. I don't know him.

Mr. Del Guercio: You don't know him.

Well, if your Honor please,——

The Witness: (Interposing) Well, I don't know him personally.

Mr. Del Guercio: (Continuing) ——I move that all this testimony be stricken.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, you don't have to know a witness. He testifies as to the witness' reputation. He has to know his reputation, not know his personally. He has to know his reputation in the mouths of the people either generally or the community in which he lives and works.

(Testimony of Benjamin E. Mallary.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Who are some of the other members of this —give me the names of all of the members of the State Personnel Board?

A. There are about 350.

Q. Of the Board?

A. Oh, I beg your pardon. I thought you were talking about the California Personnel Management Association. Ex-Senator Christian of Hayward; Mr. Arthur Brown of San Bernardino; Mr. Harry Luchins of San Francisco; Mr. Irvin Spurback [6184] of Sacramento.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

(Witness excused.)

Presiding Inspector: Now we will call back the Alien.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Gladstein: I have finished with my redirect examination. I may say this, your Honor: There are a number of requests that were made. As you noticed in the redirect examination, I attempted to bring out that Mr. Bridges had attempted to make a search for certain documents that were sort of requested by Mr. Del Guercio.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: And I have some notes on some others he requested for which we had not had time to make a search. So we may later on have occasion to ask Mr. Bridges to take the stand for five minutes to identify certain documents. Otherwise we have finished with the redirect examination.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. That is quite understandable.

Recross Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You say that you can recall an expression used by Harry Jackson or that you did recall an expression used by [6185] Harry Jackson in his speech at the Civic Auditorium on June 19, 1934, and that that expression was that "They can call us 'Red', but they can't call us 'Yellow' ". Is that correct? A. That's substantially.

Q. Whom did he mean? Whom did Harry Jackson refer to when he said that "They can call us 'Red' but they can't call us 'Yellow' "?

A. Possibly those who criticised the fact that they were connected with the strike.

Q. Did he mean you? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Were you called a "Red"?

A. Oh, oh, yes.

Q. Well, did he mean you when he said that it was all right to call you a "Red", but as long as they don't call you "Yellow"?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No. He was referring to the Marine Workers Industrial Union that was called a "Red" Union, I guess.

Q. Well now, was Harry Jackson speaking to the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time?

A. No. It was a public meeting. The auditorium was packed.

Q. And this was on June 19, 1934, is that correct? [6186]

A. I am not sure if that was the date. It seems to me that the meeting was after July the 5th.

Q. And did not Harry Jackson at the same time also advocate a general strike?

A. He might have. I think every speaker did. That was one of the purposes of the meeting.

Q. Well, as a matter of fact, Harry Jackson advocated a general strike, John Schomaker advocated it long before the killing of pickets? I say, long before—at least two or three weeks before—that took place? A. I don't think so.

Q. Huh? A. I don't think so.

Q. Do you want me to refresh your memory?

A. Yes. I still don't think so. The idea of a general strike, I am sure, didn't come up until after the threat to open the Port and after the actual move to open the Port. There was talk of a general strike if they went ahead with their plans. [6187]

Q. Now, Sam Darcy was advocating also a general strike long before these events took place?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. There were 50,000 people advocating that as far as I know.

Q. Before July 5, 1934?

A. Well, I know—I know at least one or two unions—I know the Machinists' Union had taken a general strike vote way in advance.

Q. And you were in favor of it yourself before July 5, were you not?

A. I am not sure as to that, but I think so, along the lines I have indicated.

Q. Let's go back to this resolution that was passed by the San Francisco Labor Council——

A. (Interposing) This resolution would indicate the time of the meeting.

Q. Was this the resolution that was passed——

A. (Interposing) I don't know—what is the date?

Q. I will read it for you:

"Whereas Communist propagandists have taken advantage of the waterfront strike to issue numerous scurrilous attacks upon the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and upon the duly elected officers of said unions; and,

"Whereas, the anonymous slander of the A. F. of L. unions [6188] and officials thereof has had a tendency to weaken the morale of the strikers and to confuse the minds of trade unionists not familiar with the tactics of a Communistic character; and,

"Whereas, at a mass meeting of the waterfront strikers held in the Civic Auditorium, Tuesday, June

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

19, the Chairman introduced a spokesman for a notorious Communist organization, thereby creating the altogether erroneous impression that the unions involved have made common cause with the Communists;

"Therefore, Be It Resolved, by the San Francisco Labor Council in regular meeting assembled on Friday, June 22, that we repudiate all Communist organizations, especially the so-called Marine Workers Industrial Union, and denounce their efforts to inject themselves into an industrial conflict for the sole purpose of making converts to Communism;

"Further, Be It Resolved, that the San Francisco Labor Council strongly advises the International Longshoremen's Association, its members and its representatives to disavow all connections with the Communist element on the waterfront; and,

"Further, Be It Resolved, that copies of the resolution be forwarded to the President of the American Federation of Labor, the Presidents of the International unions involved, and to the press."

[6189]

You remember that resolution, don't you?

A. Yes. Did you read who it was signed by?

Q. You were bound by it, weren't you?

A. No.

Q. You weren't bound by it?

A. The particular local union that I was a member of——

Q. (Interposing): You were a member of the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ILA at that time, were you not? You were Chairman of the Strike Committee? A Yes.

Q. Formed by that ILA union, were you not?

A. Yes.

Q. And yet you were working with the Marine Workers Industrial Union, with Harry Jackson and Sam Darcy before after that resolution was adopted?

A. You have heard why. You forgot to mention who that resolution was introduced by, and there were many things surrounding it, and which we were not bound by.

Q. The resolution was adopted, was it not, that resolution I read?

A. It was adopted by the Labor Council. I have seen a lot of things adopted by the Labor Council that didn't bind us and we didn't approve of.

Q. How many unions did that Labor Council represent?

A. Oh, at that time—I don't know—possibly 70 or [6190] 100, something like that.

Q. It represented all of the unions that were on strike, excepting the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time, if that was a union, did it not?

A. No.

Q. Were there any unions, any bona fide unions, American Federation of Labor Unions, that weren't represented in the San Francisco Labor Council at that time? A. Sure.

Q. That were on strike? A. Yes.

Q. Who?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. The Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, and the American Radio Telegraphists' Association.

Q. The ARTA?

A. Yes—independent unions, both of them.

Q. They weren't AF of L affiliates, were they?

A. No. They were independent. They pulled out of the AF of L because it was too rotten for them.

Q. And the Communists controlled the ARTA, particularly? A. No, you are wrong.

Q. Communist controlled and Communist dominated? A. No, you are wrong.

Q. Huh?

A. No, you are wrong. Your agents have misinformed you [6191] again.

Mr. Del Guercio: I might say that you are—I won't say "misinformed."

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, that resolution that was passed by the San Francisco Labor Council was sent down to your own local, wasn't it? A. Yes.

Q. What did your local do about it?

A. The local approved it.

Q. Did they do anything else besides approving it? A. How do you mean?

Q. Didn't your own local—to refresh your memory—didn't your own local pass a resolution to the effect that to any person who refused to abide, any members of the local who refused to abide by the advice of the San Francisco Labor Council to dis-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

avow all connections with the Communist element on the waterfront shall be held on trial on charges of insubordination and, if found guilty, shall be expelled from Local 38-79, International Longshoremen's Association?

A. I don't know. I don't recall if they passed that resolution.

Q. Did you consider yourself bound by such a resolution of your own local? [6192]

A. If they passed it. I don't know if they did.

Q. Did you check the records, the minutes, then, to determine whether that resolution was passed by your local?

A. No. They are missing, but I have a hunch where they are at now.

Q. Huh? A. They are missing.

Q. What?

A. The minutes are missing; but I have a hunch where they are at now.

Q. Are the records of the Central Labor Council also missing?

A. They are not very friendly with me and won't make them available to me.

Q. Is anybody but a Communist friendly with you? A. Well——

Q. (Interposing): Strike that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, the minutes of the San Francisco Labor Council are published, are they not, and are available to the public?

A. Yes. It used to be the custom, unless it is

changed, to publish them in their weekly journal, or at least to publish them very briefly.

Q. Are the minutes of any of your unions available to the public?

A. Some of them; yes. [6193]

Q. All of them?

A. No, not all of them. The minutes of our meetings during the strike weren't. The only people that could get them were the agents of the employers.

Q. Do you consider your own unions to be sort of public organizations?

A. Public organizations?

Q. Yes.

A. What do you mean by "public organizations"?

Q. What do you mean by it? A. Huh?

Q. What do you think I mean by it?

Mr. Gladstein: I suggest that is immaterial.

A. A public organization is an organization that, for example, operates in the public welfare, operated by the public, operated by the State, Federal or City Government.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you consider, under your definition, your unions are public organizations?

A. No, I wouldn't class them as a proper public organization. I wouldn't consider an organization a public organization unless the public is admitted to all its activities, its meetings.

I am sure the FBI is not a public organization.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Don't compare the FBI with your union.

[6194]

A. No, I shouldn't want to.

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, the FBI is a Governmental agency and shouldn't be taken by either this witness, or anybody else——

Presiding Inspector: That is true, but let's go right along.

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to go on record as resenting those remarks made by the witness, counsel, and anybody else that makes them against any Governmental agency.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly; it will be on the record. He is merely giving his viewpoint.

Mr. Del Guercio: Even if it is his viewpoint, your Honor, it is not only bad taste but——

Presiding Inspector: Well——

Mr. Del Guercio: This is our Government here, we hope.

Presiding Inspector: There is no use wrangling with the witness. Go on. It doesn't affect anybody.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all, excepting that reservation I made earlier.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: That is all.

(Witness excused.)

Presiding Inspector: Next witness. [6195]

Mrs. King: I am sorry, but we have no others—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) We have no oth-

ers for today. We didn't expect the cross examination to end so soon.

Presiding Inspector: You don't want to depend on cross examination.

Mr. Gladstein: That is true.

There is one other request we might make at this time and that is in connection with the witness, Cannalonga. You will recall that there was a letter shown to you, and also to me, by Mr. Del Guercio. It is our feeling that since that bears on the subject it ought to be offered in evidence.

Mr. Del Guercio: We will offer it in evidence at the proper time.

Mr. Gladstein: You don't have objection?

Mr. Del Guercio: We object to it at this time; but at the proper time before the hearing is over, no.

Mr. Grossman: We probably should go into conference in chambers about the matter we discussed before, and if there is any news on that Mr. Del Guercio will probably know whether there is.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. We will have a conference in chambers.

We will now recess until tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 3:40 p.m., an adjournment was taken to Wednesday, June 4, 1941, at 10:00 a.m.) [6196]

Court Room 276,
Federal Building,
San Francisco, California
June 4, 1941

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A. M.

[6197]

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to wait for Mr. Gladstein?

Mr. Grossman: No. We can start.

Presiding Inspector: All right. Call your next witness, Mr. Grossman.

Stand and raise your right hand.

HENRY P. MELNIKOW

called as a witness on behalf of the Alien, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your name?

A. Henry P. Melnikow—M-e-l-n-i-k-o-w.

Q. Your address?

A. 2333 Rose Street, Berkeley, California.

Presiding Inspector: Speak louder. Draw up your chair and speak louder so they can hear you over there.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your business, Mr. Melnikow?

A. I am the Director of the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau, which is a business engaged in furnishing

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

statistical research and personal representation on behalf of trade unions in connection with negotiation, mediation and arbitration proceedings and collective bargaining. [6198]

Q. For how long have you been connected with the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. Since 1921.

Q. Were you doing similar work before that time?

A. No. That was when I came out from the middle west shortly after my overseas service.

Q. Has your time been devoted almost exclusively, or exclusively, to such work since 1921?

A. Practically exclusively.

Q. Does your organization do work for all types of unions?

A. All standard or bona fide unions. We do not do work for company unions.

Q. In what cities does your organization represent unions?

A. We have branch offices in Portland and Seattle at the present time, and in Vancouver, British Columbia. [6199]

Q. Have you had occasion personally to represent unions in other cities besides these where you have stated you have branch offices?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to any further testimony along this line.

Presiding Inspector: This is for qualification, I suppose; Identification and qualification. I will al-

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

low it to a certain extent. I think he may go somewhat further. Of course, it isn't material on the direct issue.

Mr. Grossman: You may answer.

Presiding Inspector: You may answer.

Mr. Del Guercio: He was asked for his qualifications in trade union matters. That isn't at issue here.

Presiding Inspector: I know. But this shows, I suppose, his knowledge on the general subject on which I anticipate, judging from the testimony of the Witness Kagel, that he is going to be examined on.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember the question?

A. I think I do. I have represented unions as far East as Washington and as far South as San Diego and as far North as Vancouver, British Columbia.

Presiding Inspector: As far East as Washington, D. C.?

The Witness: Yes, sir. [6200]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Does your organization have regular retainers in the sense that it does regular work for certain unions?

A. Yes. About half of our work is done on that basis and the other half is on what we call a "special-job" basis.

Q. Could you estimate about how many unions

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

there are for which your organization does regular work? And I am including your branch offices in this question.

A. Between 75 and 100.

Q. Could you estimate the number of unions you personally have done work for during the last several years? Just a rough estimate.

A. As a rough estimate I would place it at 300.

Q. Could you estimate about how many different international unions would be included in this 300? Just a general estimate.

A. My guess would be about 35.

Q. Could you estimate the relative proportion at the present time of your clients between A. F. of L. and CIO?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see what difference that makes. They are just unions.

Mr. Grossman: If the claim were made that there were any bias. That is the only reason for laying such a basis. It is not important, though, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it is important. [6201]

Mr. Grossman: All right.

Presiding Inspector: We will see what the cross examination is.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. When was the first time that you had any

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

occasion to meet Harry Bridges in connection with this work you have been describing?

A. 1934.

Q. And what brought about your meeting with Harry Bridges?

A. I can't remember specifically, but my recollection is that it was a meeting of a committee to plan what to do about appearances before the National Longshoremen's Board.

Q. What unions was involved in that?

A. The International Longshoremen's Association, Pacific Coast District.

Q. Could you estimate about how many different issues—withdraw that.

This is a little bit difficult to express, Mr. Melnikow. What I am concerned with is different occasions in the sense that a complete negotiation is an occasion or a complete arbitration is an occasion.

Mr. Myron: Is this a question? [6202]

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: No. He is framing his question. Let him finish it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Defining "occasions" that way, that is, a whole negotiation would be an occasion or a whole arbitration would be an occasion, on how many different occasions have you worked with Harry Bridges?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the form of the question in its present form.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.

A. Without consulting my records that would be difficult to say, but my guess would be upwards of 50 and perhaps closer to 100.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you had occasion to work with Harry Bridges on arbitration proceedings? A. Yes.

Mr. Myron: Of course, we object to all this line of inquiry, your Honor, upon the ground it is immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, of course. That is your objection. But I will take it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Could you estimate about how many of these arbitra- [6203] tion proceedings, in about how many of these arbitration proceedings you were working with Harry Bridges?

A. At least 25, including what we call "Interpretation" proceedings.

Q. During the time that these occasions occurred was Harry Bridges President, either of the District of the ILA, or of the ILWU?

A. He was either President of the Local or President of the District of the ILA or the ILWU.

Q. Have you had occasion to participate in negotiations along with Harry Bridges?

A. Yes; on a number of occasions.

Q. Have you had occasion to participate in meetings that were not negotiations with Harry Bridges to discuss trade union policy and strategy?

A. Yes. Preparatory to negotiations or arbitra-

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

tions we would frequently meet to discuss policy and strategy.

Q. Mr. Melnikow, during your various trade union contacts with Harry Bridges has he at all times been a good trade unionist?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to it, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it—in his opinion.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. In your opinion?

A. Yes. In my opinion he has conducted himself as an [6204] excellent trade unionist.

Q. During the course of your contracts with Harry Bridges has he ever, in your opinion, acted in such a way as to recruit thhe workers into the Communist Party and prepare them as stooges for the proletarian revolution?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: Does he know anything about this?

Mr. Grossman: I suppose he would know the negative. In other words, it is the absence of Harry Bridges doing anything along those lines.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Myron: This is on the basis that he has seen him or heard him?

Presiding Inspector: We will find that out when you cross examine. I judge he has seen him if he participated in all these arbitrations.

A. My answer would be no, not to my knowledge.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with Harry Bridges has he ever taken the position that workers and employers cannot sit down at a table and bargain collectively with the employers in an amicable fashion resulting in benefits for the workers involved?

A. No; wherever the employer was acting in good faith his position has been that it was possible for the union to sit [6205] down and negotiate in good faith with the employer.

Q. You indicate that in some cases he has taken the position that it would not be possible to bargain collectively with employers in an amicable fashion and have it result in benefits for the workers involved?

A. In some instances, where the employers gave indication of not being in good faith, not acting in good faith, it was difficult, if not impossible, to see any good that would come from it, in his opinion.

Q. In the course of your contacts with Mr. Bridges did he ever take any action, or position, that was inconsistent with the best interests of the workers involved?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, this is based on a lot of conclusions of this witness. I will take it. I don't know how valuable it is. It is a matter for the trier of the fact when it comes to evaluate the evidence.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. No. While we have differed, I think he has always done his best to do what was best for the economic interests of the workers he represented.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You mean while you have differed for the best interests of the workers involved?

A. Yes. There have been times when I thought he was wrong and there have been times when he thought I was wrong, [6206] in our opinions.

Q. In any of these occasions when you thought he was wrong was he, in your opinion, attempting to carry out some ulterior purpose, such as aiding the Communist Party, or any other ulterior purpose, except the best interests of the workers involved?

Mr. Del Guercio: I submit that is clearly improper.

Mr. Myron: I object—unless he knows.

Presiding Inspector: This is his judgment. I will take it for what it is worth.

A. As far as I could judge, in my opinion, he was always acting in a sincere manner in what he considered the best interests of the workers.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with Harry Bridges.

Presiding Inspector: This is his conclusion Mr. Bridges' conclusion.

Mr. Grossman: Right, based on objective things, your Honor.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: Yes; I realize that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with Harry Bridges was there any action of his that you saw along the line of sabotage, or industrial violence, or advocacy of sabotage or industrial violence? [6207]

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that as improper, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know how you can see it, but I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: If the Government is going to prove it I assume there is some way of recognizing it, your Honor,

Presiding Inspector: I don't know——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Unless——

Presiding Inspector: (Continuing)——we might go into these riots we heard intimation about, if you ask questions of that kind.

Mr. Grossman: On cross examination I have no objection. I am using the wording of the statutes and I assume that there must be some way to prove such things. I don't see clearly how you would prove it but, nevertheless, if it is possible for a witness to testify Mr. Melnikow also can.

May we have an answer?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I will allow it.

A. No. The position has always been against violence, sabotage, or anything that would interfere in the lawful following up of the interests of the workers.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with Bridges did he ever advocate a policy of a strike for a strike's sake, a strike which was not justifiable, because of the economic advantages it would bring to the workers involved? [6208]

Presiding Inspector: Again, your opinion.

A. In my opinion, while he has been in favor, in one or two occasions, of strikes where we thought it was inadvisable, it was not because of lack of interest in the workers but just an honest difference of opinion as to what would be the consequences.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have there ever been occasions when you were in favor of a strike and Mr. Bridges was not in favor of such a strike, and continued to advocate having no strike?

A. Yes. On a number of occsasions we thought that the best interests of the workers would be reflected by strike action and Mr. Bridges differed with us on that. Also in the reverse—in other words, to be fair to myself. [6209]

Q. During the course of your trade union contacts with Harry Bridges did he ever engage in conduct such as unlawful destruction of property in connection with industrial disputes?

A. No.

Presiding Inspector: As far as you know?

The Witness: Not to my knowledge.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with Mr. Bridges did you find him equally willing to use the procedure of arbitration or negotiation or mediation as well as the procedure of strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please. Of course, this is all opinion testimony.

Presiding Inspector: All opinion. I will allow it. It is all opinion.

A. Generally speaking, yes, but there have been times when he has been more in favor of one method as against the other, depending on the circumstances of the case.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You mean there have been times when he was more in favor of strikes than of the other procedures that I named? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And vice versa?

A. And vice versa. There have been times when he was [6210] opposed to strikes when others, including myself, thought it would be the best procedure under the particular circumstances.

Q. During the course of your contacts with Harry Bridges did you find him regularly and continuously willing to and actually cooperating with Governmental agencies to avoid strikes where such strikes could reasonably be avoided?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to it also, with the same understanding that it is opinion testimony.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: There are two or three judgments mixed in there, aren't there? I will allow it.

The Witness: May I have the question?

Presiding Inspector: Read it to him.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. I should say, on the whole, yes. There have been instances where he wasn't sure of the good faith of the particular individual involved. He was loath to cooperate in those instances.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did Mr. Bridges ever take the position in your contacts with him that arbitration as a principle or as a general rule is bad for the workers involved?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. [6211]

A. No. He considered, as far as I could judge, that arbitration was one of the methods to be used in collective bargaining procedure.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. To your knowledge has Mr. Bridges ever taken the initiative to see to it that an arbitration set-up could be provided so that disputes between the workers and their employers could be settled without a strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that also.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: If he understands it he may answer it. I don't.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Well, do you understand it?

A. I'm not sure. May I have the question read?

Q. I will rephrase it, then. Did Mr. Bridges ever take the initiative to provide in an agreement between employers and employees some kind of an arbitration set-up to settle disputes arising under the contract?

A. Oh, yes. There have been a number of occasions where the union would not want the arbitration procedure written into the contract and would be told that it was to the best interests to have it in the contract.

Q. Told by whom? A. By Mr. Bridges.

Q. From your trade union contacts with Mr. Bridges are you able to state what was or what is his theory of the role and [6212] the function of trade unions?

Presiding Inspector: Well, haven't you had that from Mr. Bridges?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: How will this witness——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): The Government apparently disbelieves the statements Mr. Bridges made on that question.

Presiding Inspector: This merely shows that this man believes him. That is all.

Mr. Grossman: Well, your Honor, I think I

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

have qualified Mr. Melnikow sufficiently to show that his opinion of Mr. Bridges and his views may be based in part, true, on what Mr. Bridges may have said, but is based in large part at least on the activities of Mr. Bridges from which he can draw certain conclusions.

Presiding Inspector: You have shown the opinion of Mr. Melnikow about this. I have allowed it very generously. Has the question been allowed heretofore?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Are you sure about that?

Mr. Grossman: Dean Morse was permitted. You see, every question I am using was permitted either in the examination of——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): In this form?

Mr. Grossman: Yes. I have the page. It is 4579. [6213]

Presiding Inspector: Very well. I will allow it, then.

A. As near as I can judge from Mr. Bridges' utterances and actions he believed in the gradual improvement of our present economic order, economically and politically, through trade union action. I would say that I see traces of the Australian labor movement philosophy in his actions and his thoughts.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. During the course of your contacts with

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Harry Bridges have you seen any activity of his which indicated or now indicates to you that he was or is a Communist?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Well now,——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): This was permitted, your Honor, in the examination of Dean Morse.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't know that that was permitted, that particular question.

Mr. Grossman: Page 4588 of the transcript.

Presiding Inspector: Wasn't there some qualification of what this man knows about Communism?

Mr. Grossman: I know the Government raised that objection and I don't recall whether any questions were asked to qualify him. We can look at the transcript.

Presiding Inspector: Never mind. I will take the question. We will leave it to cross examination. [6214]

Mr. Grossman: I know it led to cross examination on the question. I will repeat the question.

Mr. Del Guercio: Read the question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you seen any activity of Harry Bridges which indicated or now indicates to you that he was or is a Communist? A. No.

Mr. Grossman: You may cross examine.

Presiding Inspector: Cross examination.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Cross Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is this Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. It is a private enterprise which was started in 1920 in New York by Stuart Chase and Evans Clark and a number of others, and through correspondence with them I was induced to start a branch office of what was called the Labor Bureau, Incorporated, in San Francisco.

Q. Is it incorporated?

A. No. The incorporation was dissolved and at the present time the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau is solely owned by me.

Q. You are the sole owner? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you running it for profit? [6215]

A. For compensation rather than profit, because we each have a fixed compensation; each member of the staff.

Q. What is the difference between "compensation" and "profit"; running it for "compensation" and running it for "profit"?

A. Well, in the case of profit there is a desire to make all the profit you possibly can, and in the case of compensation there is the desire to earn a certain amount as compensation for the work.

Q. Do you have any other income other than the income you receive from your work with this Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. Nothing except what I get from teaching.

Q. Where do you teach?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. I have taught at the University of California Extension Division and at the present time I teach at the Pacific Coast School for Workers every summer.

Q. Pacific Coast School for Workers?

A. Yes.

Q. Who runs it?

A. It is an Advisory Board consisting of labor people who operate it as a summer school every summer in Berkeley.

Q. Who operates it?

A. Well, this Advisory Board consists of trade unionists and educators, and they operate it. [6216]

Q. Who are they? What are their names?

A. George Headley is the Director of the school. There is a committee consisting of Mr. Maguire of the Building Service Employees, who I think is Chairman, representing the trade unionists; and a representative of the State Department of Education whose name escapes me at the moment, but I think it is Mrs. Heinneman; and I believe there is a representative of the University of California, who is John L. Kerchen; and a number of others. I think the Chairman of the Educational Committee is Mrs. May.

Q. Well now, who started this school?

A. I'm sure I can't tell.

Q. When was it started?

A. It was started years ago, and I believe it was the result of cooperation between the State Federa-

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

tion of Labor and the University of California Extension Division.

Q. And you receive a salary? A. Yes.

Q. How much?

A. $100.00 per summer.

Q. $100.00 per summer? A. Yes.

Q. Now, is that your only income other than that received from the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. I own two houses and, being unable to live in them, receive rent for them. That is another source of income. [6217]

Q. Now, when you say that you were working with Harry Bridges, do you mean that you were employed by Harry Bridges?

A. We use the word "retain" because we consider ourselves as professionals rather than employees and consider the capacity that of between client and professional consultant.

Q. Are you an attorney? A. No, sir.

Q. What kind of a profession is it?

A. Economist and statistician.

Q. What?

A. Economist and statistician. I am on the——

Q. (Interposing): "Communistic" did you say? I didn't get it. Will you speak a little louder, please?

A. Yes. I am on the Civil Service list of the United States Civil Service Commission as Principal Economist, and I consider that my profession.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. Well, is that your profession in connection with the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. Yes, sir. We call ourselves "economic counsel".

Q. Well, you sell your services, don't you?

9. We sell them?

Q. Yes.

A. In the same sense that any other professional sells his services; yes, sir. [6218]

Q. Do you sell your services?

A. Yes. We are paid for our work.

Q. And has Harry Bridges paid you for the work you have done for him?

A. Not personally, but the organizations which he represented or advised did.

Q. Now, can you estimate how much you have received from Harry Bridges and from his union that he represents during the time that you have known him?

A. It would be rather hard without consulting the books, but I should say it would run approximately $15,000 since 1934: perhaps more.

Q. $15,000 since 1934? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that include all of your employment by Harry Bridges and the unions he represents?

A. That would depend on the definition of "represents".

Q. Let's take all of the CIO Unions, for instance. How much have you received, your company received, from the CIO Unions since you started this Bueau?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: You mean which Mr. Bridges represents?

Mr. Del Guercio: With which Mr. Bridges is connected.

A. Yes. Well, I think that would begin about 1937.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That what? [6219]

A. Beginning in 1937, because prior to that, even though Mr. Bridges represented them, they were not CIO Unions. My guess—and it would be sheer guess, I would rather consult my records—would be approximately *right* or nine thousand dollars.

Q. Now, you know that Bridges is a national official of the CIO?

A. I don't know it, but I have been told that.

Q. Have you represented also any other CIO Unions on the Pacific Coast?

A. Yes, quite a large number.

Q. Can you estimate your total income, say since 1937, since the time that the CIO Unions came into existence; your total income received from all CIO Unions?

A. That's difficult to estimate, but I will venture a guess that it would be about a third of the annual income of the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau.

Q. And what is the annual income of the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau?

A. It runs between seventy and ninety thousand dollars, a year.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. And a third of that would be about $25,000?

A. Something like that.

Q. How many people are employed by your Bureau?

A. It ranged from about twenty-five to about thirty on [6220] an average and sometimes there wwill be as many as forty or fifty all together, including temporary employees as we are pressed.

Q. That includes clerks and stenographers?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many clerks and stenographers do you have? A. About ten.

Q. Now, when you say that you participated in negotiations with Harry Bridges do you mean that you were employed by Harry Bridges in such negotiations? A. We use the term "retained".

Q. Well, weren't you employed? Did you sell your services to Harry Bridges in such negotiations?

A. In a sense, yes. But we regard the retainer as being a more independent relationship. In other words, if a union or its representatives asked me or anybody connected with the Bureau to do anything that we considered unprofessional we would merely sever the connection with that retainer.

Q. What are the professional ethics of a Bureau such as you represent? Are they written ones?

A. Yes. We have had ever since it started four cardinal principles.

Q. You mean you have?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. Yes, and the Labor Bureau, Incorporated, which started in 1920 had exactly—— [6221]

Q. (Interposing): Is that your own company?

A. No. That was the corporation of which Stuart Chase was President and was until very recently the president. [6222]

Q. Is that a corporation?

A. That was a corporation and it has been dissolved recently.

Q. Your organization is not a corporation?

A. Not at the present time; no.

We followed those four cardinal principles, which were as follows:

First, not to have any political affiliation, but to adhere strictly to the economic field of action.

Second, to take no part in any inter-union conflicts or factional fights.

And to do the work on a strictly professional basis on the assumption that the facts and figures would, in the long-run, benefit labor more than any misrepresentation.

And, finally, to do it on as nearly a cost basis as possible.

Q. Is there any organization or bureau to check up on you to see whether or not you live up to those ethics?

A. We have always invited it.

Q. Is there any organization or bureau—read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Presiding Inspector: You may answer the question directly.

A. Yes—the answer is that we have invited the repre- [6223] sentatives of organized labor to check whenever they wanted to, but they never have taken occasion or advantage of the invitation.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Then your answer is that there is no such organization to check on you?

A. There is, but they have never taken any occasion to do it.

Q. Is there any governmental agency set up to check up on the ethics of your Bureau?

A. Not directly. I am in continuous touch with Dr. Steelman, and the other Mediation bodies, and they are in a pretty fair position to judge of our activities.

Q. Do you know what the policy of the Communist Party is toward trade unions?

A. Towards trade unions?

Q. Yes.

A. I can't say that I am an expert on the subject, but from my readings I would say that at various times that policy has changed. At times they have wanted to set up dual organizations; at other times, apparently, the idea was to control the organizations without setting up dual organizations.

Q. What literature have you read?

A. Oh, generally the issues of the American Federation [6224] of Labor publications, and similar publications.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. Have you read Communist literature?

A. No, not to any extent; nothing except as it happened to fall into my hands.

Q. Have you ever conferred with and consulted with members of the Communist Party?

A. Not to my knowledge. There may have been those who were members, or officials, but I didn't know it.

Q. Did you ever represent Harry Jackson?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Do you know Harry Jackson?

A. I had him pointed out to me by Mr. Paul Scharrenberg.

Q. Have you ever had any business relations with Harry Jackson?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Have you ever been a paid advisor of Harry Jackson? A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. Would your books show that?

A. That is, unless he was a member of an organization which I represented and I didn't know that he was a member thereof.

Q. Did your organization ever represent the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever been a paid advisor of Mervyn Rathborne? [6225]

A. Yes, I think so. I think when he was in charge of, what is called now the American Communications Association out here, we participated in negotiations for that union.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. Have you ever been a paid advisor of Walter Stack? A. Walter Stack?

Q. Yes.

A. I think he served on one committee of the Marine Firemen's Union at a time when we represented them.

Q. Were you ever employed by Walter Stack?

Presiding Inspector: What?

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Were you ever employed by Walter Stack at any time?

A. Not in any personal way. We have been employed by the organization, the Marine Firemen's Association.

Q. Through whom were those negotiations carried out, your employment?

A. I didn't catch that.

Mr. Del Guercio: Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. Through a committee.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Was Walter Stack on that Committee?

A. I am not sure whether he was on the Committee at the time we were retained, or came in later. I am inclined [6226] to believe the latter is true; that we were retained and he came down from, I believe, Seattle and joined the Committee and we were retained.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. Do you know if Walter Stack is a member of the Communist Party, and was a member at the time you had these business transactions with him?

A. No, I didn't; and I don't know it today.

Q. You never heard that Walter Stack has admitted that he is and has been a member of the Communist Party?

A. No. I have seen some references to statements that he was a member of the Communist Party in the newspapers, but that is as far as my own knowledge goes.

Q. Haven't you seen the same things about Harry Bridges in the newspapers. A. Yes.

Q. As you have Walter Stack?

A. Yes. I have also seen publications about me too, but I knew better than to believe them.

Q. Do you believe that Walter Stack is a member of the Communist Party?

A. Do I believe it?

Q. Yes.

A. I have no basis on which to have an intelligent belief.

Q. Have you any basis on which to believe whether or [6227] not Harry Bridges is a member of the Communist Party?

A. Only through my continuous contact with him, and observations of his actions.

Q. Did you have the same opportunity with regard to Walter Stack?

A. No, not nearly the same. It was very limited compared to my contacts with Mr. Bridges.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. You have come in contact with a lot of trade union men, have you not?

A. Yes, sir; hundreds and thousands.

Q. Hundreds and thousands of them. Over what period of time? A. Since 1913.

Q. In your contacts with these hundreds of thousands of labor men have you ever discovered one who was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well, there is one I am sure of. When he was negotiating for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, I was told Mr. Sam Diner was a Communist and also that he was a stooge for the employees, and I didn't know which to believe.

Presiding Inspector: Stooge for whom?

The Witness: For the employers.

Presiding Inspector: You said "employees".

By Mr. Del Guercio: [6228]

Q. Sam Diner is the only one that you can remember out of these hundreds of thousands—did you say hundreds of thousands?

A. No. I said hundreds and thousands.

Q. And the only one you can think of is Sam Diner?

A. Well, that is the only one that occurs to me right now, and that apparently on his own statement.

Q. Can you think of anyone else of these hundreds and thousands of labor men that you have come in contact with——

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. (Interposing): Off-hand, no.

Q. Sam Diner is the only one?

A. That occurs to me at the moment; yes, sir.

Q. You have come in contact with Harry Jackson, haven't you?

A. Just by having him pointed out to me by Paul Scharrenberg on one occasion.

Q. By whom? A. Paul Scharrenberg.

Q. What did Paul Scharrenberg have to say about him, if anything?

Presiding Inspector: I cannot hear.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. What he said would hardly be printable.

By Mr. Del Guercio: [6229]

Q. About Harry Jackson? What did he say?

A. He called him a "blankety-blankety-blank"——

Q. (Interposing): What?

A. A "blankety-blankety-blank Red".

Q. Do you know that Harry Bridges has associated with Harry Jackson?

A. I don't know it, but it may be quite true.

Q. Huh? A. It may be quite true.

Q. Do you know what Bridges' associations wi Harry Jackson were?

A. Not from my personal knowledge; no.

Q. You have no knowledge at all on that?

A. No, sir.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. Do you know what Harry Bridges' associations were with Sam Darcy, or have been?

A. No, sir.

Q. Huh? A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know who Sam Darcy is?

A. I have heard that he was an official of the Communist Party.

Q. And you don't know anything about Harry Bridges' association with Sam Darcy?

A. No, sir. [6230]

Q. Do you know who Elmer Hanoff is?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever heard of him?

A. Only what I have read in the newspapers recently.

Q. Do you know what Harry Bridges' associations with Elmer Hanoff have been?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know William Schneidermann?

A. I have had him pointed out to me at a convention a couple of years ago.

Q. What convention was that?

A. CIO convention in San Francisco.

Q. Was Schneidermann present?

A. He was there as a spectator and one of the persons there I knew pointed him out and said, "There is Schneidermann."

Q. Where was that convention held?

A. It was held in Polk Hall.

Q. Where?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. Polk Hall, the Civic Auditorium, of the City and County of San Francisco.

Q. What date?

A. It was August, I believe, of '35 or '36—I am not sure—maybe '37. I would have to look that up.

Q. Was Schneidermann on the speakers' stand?

[6231]

A. No. He was present in the same capacity that I was, just looking on.

Q. Who pointed him out to you?

A. I can't recall at this time, but somebody who was with me said, "There is Bill Schneidermann."

Q. Do you know Morris Rapport?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever heard of him?

A. Not except what I saw in the newspapers while I was up in the northwest about some proceedings in which he was involved.

Q. Isn't he considered an authority on trade union matters?

A. I wouldn't consider him such without more knowledge than I have of him at the present time.

Q. Do you know Walter Lambert?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you heard of him?

A. Only what I have read in the papers recently.

Q. In any of your transactions, business transactions, with any of these unions has the name of Walter Lambert ever come up?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. I don't think so directly. I think, perhaps, in an indirect way his name may have been mentioned, but if it was I can't recall at the present time. [6232]

Q. Do you know what association Harry Bridges has had with Walter Lambert? A. No, sir.

Q. Were you ever associated with the Sailors Union of the Pacific? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When?

A. Back in 1934, 1935 and, I think, in 1936.

Q. In what capacity?

A. In the same capacity as with all the other unions, retained to assist them in a professional way in their negotiations and arbitrations.

Q. Have you ever been retained by them since then?

A. No. They had a difference of policy as to living up to agreements or doing it by job action; that is, changing the agreement by job action versus striking, and they decided that our services would not assist them because they were going to do it by way of job action, rather than collective bargaining procedure direct.

Q. Isn't it a fact that you were kicked out of the Sailors Union of the Pacific for 99 years?

A. Kicked out? No, sir.

Q. Not literally kicked out—but you know what I mean.

A. Yes. To answer that fairly—I was told that a resolution was passed by the Sailors Union of

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

the Pacific that [6233] they would not use our services for a period of 99 years.

Presiding Inspector: What do you mean by "job action"?

The Witness: By job action is meant such activities right on the job as will force the employer to do what the union wants them to do.

Presiding Inspector: Sabotage?

The Witness: Not necessarily; although that is a part of the extreme form, yes, sir.

Presiding Inspector: Sit-down strikes?

The Witness: Yes; or walking off the job at the end of six hours when the agreement calls for eight hours, and saying "That is our day's work done unless you pay us overtime"—something like that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Didn't the ILA use job action on various docks during 1934 and 1936? A. The ILA?

Q. Yes.

A. Not in the same degree or in the same way; no, sir.

Q. In what way did they differ?

A. They never walked off the job at the end of six hours. For example, if they walked off the job it was simply on the ground that the award under which they were operating said that the employees could choose their jobs and the [6234] employers could choose their men; and whenever the men didn't like the conditions of employment they said, "We hereby do not choose this job," and walked off with that as an excuse—which gives it

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

a little bit different situation than a sailor walking off the job from the ship.

Q. Well, it was still job action?

A. To that extent, yes; it was a form of job action.

Presiding Inspector: Is that good trade union policy?

The Witness: I think it is justifiable only in extreme occasions. I do not think it is ordinarily good trade union policy.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Have you ever been a member of the Harry Bridges Defense Committee?

A. I am not sure. I was called up on the telephone and asked if I would permit my name to be used and I said, "Yes." Whether they are actually using it or not I can't say.

Q. The present one, you mean?

A. No. I think that was some time ago. I don't know what the present situation is.

Q. Have you made any contributions toward the Harry Bridges Defense Fund?

A. I do not believe so.

Q. You do not believe so?

A. I mean I do not remember that I did. I may have, but [6235] I don't remember.

Q. Wouldn't you know it if you did?

A. I don't know that—I didn't directly.

Q. Did you do it directly or indirectly?

A. It may have been that somebody passed a

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

slip around our office and there might have been a contribution made that way. That is what I have in mind.

Q. Did you make a contribution there?

A. No, I haven't personally.

Q. Did your company—whatever you call it—the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau, make any contribution? A. No, sir.

Q. In any form?

A. No, sir—well, in the form that some employee may have passed a slip around; yes, I think there was such a slip passed around.

Q. Did you solicit contributions in your office for it? A. No, I didn't.

Q. Did you give permission for anyone to solicit contributions?

A. No one asked my permission.

Q. They just walked in and did it?

A. What I said was some employee in the office may have circulated such a slip.

Q. Do you know Sam Kagel? [6236]

A. Yes; very well. He is my right hand——

Q. (Interposing) Is he employed by you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is he on a salary basis? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his salary?

A. $425.00 a month.

Q. $425.00. Are you on a salary basis?

A. Yes.

Q. What is your salary?

A. $600.00 a month.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. $600.00 a month? A. Yes.

Q. Are there any other high salaried employees in your organization?

A. It depends on the definition of "high." I think the next person gets $350.00, and it ranges down to $130.00 for the stenographer.

Q. All these salaries come from your employment with these unions? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is done with the—are all the funds you receive expended in salaries?

A. No, sir. We have a sizeable overhead.

Q. Do you have a reserve fund? [6237]

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much do you have in that reserve fund at the present time?

A. I am not sure that I can tell you, but it must be about $6500 or $7500.

Q. And in whose name is that?

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) Just a moment. I don't want to make a legal objection. This seems to be completely irrelevant. However, unless Mr. Melnikow has any desire to——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Well, now——

Mr. Grossman: (Continuing) Let me finish.

I say, if Mr. Melnikow has any reasons to desire any kind of secrecy, which cannot be maintained in the light of this series of questions, with reference to any of his business transactions, I believe he should express himself and I think your Honor should rule. But from our standpoint we have no

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

objection, although we think it is completely irrelevant.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think he has any objection.

The Witness: On the contrary—our financial books, and otherwise, are always open and available.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You don't want to hide anything?

A. Not a thing.

Mr. Grossman: I withdraw my statement.

By Mr. Del Guercio: [6238]

Q. What do you do with the moneys you receive in excess of salaries and overhead?

A. We put it in a savings account and draw on it when we begin to run into the red.

Q. When you say "we", do you mean you put it into a savings account? A. Yes.

Q. The money is in your name — it is your money?

A. It is in the name of the Pacific Coast Labor Bureau, which is a trade name, and of which I am the sole owner.

Q. You are the sole owner? A. Yes.

Q. Where were you born, Mr. Melnikow?

A. In Kiev—K-i-e-v—Russia.

Q. Did you try to go out of the United States recently, Mr. Melnikow?

A. Yes. I just returned from Canada last week.

Q. Were you permitted to enter Canada?

A. I was on the last occasion. On the occasion before I was deported.

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

Q. When was that?

A. The order for deportation is dated May 6, 1941.

Q. Were you made the subject of deportation proceedings in Canada? A. Yes, sir.

Q. On what ground? [6239]

A. On the ground that I was not an accredited representative of an International Trade Union, and that I was entering Canada under contract.

The Immigration official who was responsible for this order did not tell the truth to the newspapers and published a report that it was because of doubt of my United States citizenship. He has since explained to me that he thought it would sound better if he put it on that basis, rather than make a labor matter of it.

However, within a couple of hours after I went back to Seattle they sent a message that I could come back and that all was a mistake.

I have the deportation order here if you would like to see it. [6240]

Q. You were served with a notice of your exclusion order, were you not?

A. I didn't get that.

Q. You were served——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Read the question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing) ——with an order of your exclusion, were you not?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

A. Yes, sir. I have it right here.

Q. How does it read?

A. Just as I have read it a minute ago.

Q. May I see it? A. Certainly.

(The document referred to was passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You were examined here by the Canadian Immigration Officers at Vancouver, were you not?

A. Yes, sir; at the airport there.

Q. Sir? A. At the airport.

Q. At the airport in Seattle? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you given a hearing?

A. No. I was merely asked a lot of questions and then told that I would be barred. I asked whether the law had been changed and I was told, No, it hadn't been. And then—— [6241]

Q. (Interposing) Was there some question about whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party? A. No, sir.

Q. Was the Communist Party mentioned? Was the Communist Party mentioned?

A. No, sir. The only ground that was mentioned was the one shown in the order as you have it.

Q. Did you take an appeal from this exclusion order?

A. I did, and I was admitted later upon orders from Ottawa.

Mr. Grossman: May I have that last answer, please?

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

(The answer referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you apply for an American passport before you went to Canada?

A. No. It isn't necessary to have an American passport in going to Canada.

Q. At that time? When was that? In what year?

A. May 6, 1941. I did have my identification papers.

Q. You had an identification card?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Issued where?

A. Well, I have a number of them. One is a transcript of my registration. I got that later. And as a voter in Alameda [6242] County, California.

Q. Did you have a registration card issued at an Immigration Office? A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever discussed with leaders of the Communist Party, any leader of the Communist Party the policy of the Communist Party towards trade unions? A. No, sir.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all, your Honor.

Mr. Grossman: Just one moment, please.

Redirect Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Are you a citizen of the United States, Mr. Melnikow? A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the occasion when you were first not per-

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

mitted to enter Canada what was the reason for your trip to Canada?

A. I was to represent the three divisions of the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America in an arbitration against the British Columbia Electric Railway, Limited.

Q. Do you know whether Harry Bridges took any position on job action in 1935?

A. Yes. He was opposed to it.

Q. Can you state what if anything he did to carry out [6243] that opposition?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I don't suppose you can show individual acts.

Mr. Grossman: This matter was brought out in connection with the Sailor's Union of the Pacific, his position on job action.

Presiding Inspector: Not in relation with anything to Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: Not in relation with anything to Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Grossman: All right. It is not too important. His position is well known.

No more questions.

Presiding Inspector: Would mass picketing be job action?

The Witness: No, sir. Job action relates to action on the job before a strike is called. That is, the

(Testimony of Henry P. Melnikow.)

people remain on the job and continue to draw their pay, but do things which they trust will force the employer's hand.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Grossman: No more questions.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

(Witness excused.)

Presiding Inspector: Next witness.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, at this time we rest our case [6244] except for the fact that we have a witness, Mr. Lord, who I think will be here tomorrow morning. We mentioned it to you, and naturally we are going to ask leave when he comes to put him on out of order.

Presiding Inspector: I think there will be no objection to that.

Mr. Grossman: Otherwise we rest our case.

Presiding Inspector: No, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Grossman: Could we have a recess now, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: Call your witness, Mr. Del Guercio.

F. J. M. ERNEST

called as a witness in rebuttal on behalf of the Government, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination

Presiding Inspector: Give your name and address.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. State your name, please.

A. F. J. M. Ernest.

Q. Where do you reside?

A. Portland, Oregon.

Q. What is your profession?

A. Physician and surgeon.

Q. And are you connected with any Governmental agency [6245] at this time?

A. I am with the Veteran's Administration.

Q. In what capacity?

A. Neuro-psychiatrist.

Q. For how long a period have you been so connected with the Veteran's Bureau?

A. Since 1922 I have been doing nothing but such work.

Q. Are you also a physician and surgeon?

A. I am.

Q. For how long a period?

A. 1904. I graduated in 1904.

Q. What college did you graduate from?

A. I am a graduate of Kansas; Post-Graduate of Rush, Chicago; Sanitary School of Lyon, France; and University of California Medical.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. Do you know a Richard Lovelace?

A. Yes.

Q. And will you state for how long a period you knew him and under what circumstances?

A. I have known him since he came to Oregon in, I think, 1929.

Q. And did you ever treat Richard Lovelace?

A. Yes. I took care of him—oh, I examined him on a number of occasions and he reported to the Veteran's Hospital [6246] at Portland, and he was admitted to our hospital on February 20th this year after having had a stroke, and he was under my supervision until he died on the 13th day of March.

Q. Now, you say that he was under your supervision until the time of his death? A. Yes.

Q. And for how long a period prior to his death had you been treating him at the Veteran's Bureau?

A. Pardon? I didn't get the question.

Q. For how long a period had you been treating him at the Veteran's Bureau prior to his death?

A. He was a Veteran of the World War and he had been to our hospital on a number of occasions previous to this last admission, and over a period of years ever since—I think I first knew him shortly after he came to Oregon, because he came up to the Veteran's Hospital. I didn't know him well or markedly until 1932 when he ran for Congressman, United States Congressman on the Communist ticket. Then in '34 he ran for the State Legislature on the same ticket. I knew him then, and two or three years later I began to know him better, and for the last two

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

or three years I had been pretty closely associated with him.

Q. What was Mr. Lovelace's mental condition during the time that you knew him up until the time of his death?

A. Well, he was an intelligent, very conscientious, rather clever individual. He was bright, active.

[6247]

Q. Did you notice any mental impairment in his mental faculties in any period of time that you knew him and treated him?

A. Oh, no. Mentally alert.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to discuss Mr. Lovelace's reputation for truth and veracity in the community in which he lived? A. No.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all. Just one more question, if your Honor please. May I?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You knew a Mr. MacMickle who calls himself a "doctor"? A. No.

Q. Did you ever discuss Mr. Lovelace's condition with a Mr. MacMickle? A. No.

Q. A Virgil MacMickle? A. No.

Q. Either over the telephone or otherwise?

A. No.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is all.

Presiding Inspector: I would like to ask a few questions.

What is paranoia?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

The Witness: Paranoia is a mental sickness in which the [6248] individual has an exalted idea of his own ability and efficiency. It's a delusional state.

Presiding Inspector: Is it a well-recognized condition?

The Witness: Very well recognized.

Presiding Inspector: And is it easily recognizable?

The Witness: Easily recognizable.

Presiding Inspector: Now, will you state whether or not at any time up to the time that you say this man had a stroke whether he was suffering from paranoia?

The Witness: Oh, no.

Presiding Inspector: Do you want to ask anything else?

Mr. Del Guercio: No.

Mr. Grossman: Just a moment.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Doctor Ernest, do you consider that you specialize in the field of psychiatry? A. Yes.

Q. Are you attached to the staff of the Veteran's Hospital in Portland? A. I am.

Q. Do you do any other work besides the work for the hospital?

A. Oh, no. I have been wholly employed by the Veteran's Administration; I mean, in full time.

Q. Is the work that you do for the hospital confined to the specialization of psychiatric work?

[6249]

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. Well, every member of a general hospital has to do general work as well as his specialty, but my work on that staff is neuro-psychiatry. For instance, I have to be the officer of the day when my turn comes and I have general care then of all patients.

Q. Now, for how long have you been specializing —rather, put it this way: For how long has most of your work in the Veteran's Hospital been within the field of psychiatry? A. Since 1922.

Q. Now, what is the practice in the Veteran's Hospital with respect to whether a patient is treated by one doctor or several doctors or a combination of those two methods?

A. Well, the staff of a Veteran's Hospital constitutes a clinic and his examination covers all the specialties. I mean, if he requires any special examination there is a member of the staff to do that.

Q. I see. Suppose a man returned several times to the hospital, is he treated or examined by the same doctor?

A. Well,——

Q. (Interposing) Generally speaking?

A. Generally speaking, no. A man is admitted to the hospital through the admission and diagnostic service, and there is one officer in charge of that service. So that any [6250] time he is admitted other than by the officer of the day he comes through that service, but his treatment will be according to the disablement for which he has been admitted.

For instance, if he is a cardiac case he will be sent

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

to the cardiac ward. If it is a tuberculosis, then the tubercular specialist will have him. If he is a neurological case he will come under my supervision or neuro-psychiatric work, and g.u. and so on. Surgical work goes to the surgical service.

Q. Can you state when was the first time that you had occasion to examine Mr. Lovelace from a medical standpoint?

A. Oh, I — roughly speaking, I should say it might have been *been* the fall of '29 or the spring of '30. It was just after he had come to Oregon.

Q. And on that occasion was any treatment given him by you? A. No.

Q. On that occasion were there several examinations or only one?

A. I didn't get your question.

Q. Were there several examinations or only one on that occasion?

A. On that occasion he came in for examination for rating purposes.

Presiding Inspector: For what?

The Witness: For rating purposes. [6251]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Disability rating purposes?

A. For rating purposes; examination to determine whether he has compensation coming and how much, and they are examined in—any patient coming in that way will be examined by the different members of the diagnostic staff.

Q. When was the next time you had occasion to examine Mr. Lovelace?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. Well, it's over the period of years from that time on, until he was admitted the last time, I can't give you the dates of that.

Q. Can you make an estimate of the number of times, very generally, during that period that you either examined him or treated him?

A. Well, it would be rather hard to make an estimate. Possibly once in two years or such a matter. The regulations have been changed with reference to the number of times men are called in for examination for rating purposes.

Q. Would you state that you had examined Mr. Lovelace at no time except when he was brought in for rating purposes?

A. I never examined—oh, for rating purposes, yes. I have examined him at times when he was in the hospital for other conditions. For instance, he was hospitalized a time for a cardiac disease, for heart disease, and I reported on [6252] his condition at that time as part of the routine record.

Q. Do you remember any other occasion except the rating examinations when you examined Mr. Lovelace?

A. Well, that wasn't for rating purposes.

Q. Yes. Any others besides that one?

A. Oh, I don't recall any other time.

Q. Did you examine him for other than rating purposes after he came to the hospital in February of 1941?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. Oh, I didn't examine him at that time for rating purposes.

Q. For any purpose?

A. Oh, yes. That's for Apoplectic treatment purposes.

Q. And what was his condition when he came to the hospital in February of 1941?

A. On the 20th day of February? When he came in he was unconscious. He had just had a stroke and he was brought by ambulance.

Q. Were you the doctor who was primarily responsible for his treatment when he came to the hospital in February of 1941?

A. I was the doctor who made the examination and the diagnosis and recommended the treatment.

Q. What was your diagnosis at that time?

A. Well, generally speaking, apoplectic stroke.

Q. Had there been any medical history which tended [6253] you thought, to explain the stroke at that time?

A. Yes. The refined diagnosis was—I think I can probably—well, the diagnosis given on his death certificate—and, of course, that was arrived at after he had been admitted and after laboratory studies of various kinds had been made and after the treatment and final determination and death—was thrombotic embolism left brain, possibly or probably due to myocardial infarction, myofibrosis.

Q. What would that mean with reference to the condition of the brain at the time of the death? Could you put it in layman's language, please?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. Well, what it actually means is that at some time, and possibly when or about the time when he was last admitted to our hospital for treatment of heart disease, he probably had a coronary thrombosis—that is, one of the arteries of the heart occluded, that shut off the blood of a certain artery of the left ventricle and, as a result of that, the lack of blood supply and his ability to recover a fibrosis developed; and in those fibrous developments occasionally they will lose their own vitality enough so that a part of them will break off, and it is on the order of an organized clot.

Now, if one of those—a piece breaks off of this fibrous structure it slips into the circulation and goes out through the collateral artery, and in this case we explain it as being forced through the middie vaginal artery on the left, producing the deep vascular disturbance, as we [6254] called the stroke a while ago.

Presiding Inspector: That is, this clot, in layman's language, becomes lodged in one of the smaller arteries in the brain itself, and that occludes that artery and there is a lack of blood supply to part of the brain, and that makes the disturbance in the body?

The Witness: That's right. The usual blood supply to the brain is not—it has no collateral. This artery has so many branches and there are no collateral circulation from some other part. Now, when the piece broke off of the mural thrombus in

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

the heart it became an embolus. It was something loose, a loose body in circulation. Then it went through and followed along with the blood stream until it got to the place where it couldn't go any further and then it blocked off all beyond that area. And that's the thing that happens that brings about the stroke.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you state, Doctor, whether you have had experience with any cases where such a blood clot as you found in the brain of Richard Lovelace interferred with the mental processes of a person having such a clot?

A. Will you repeat that question? I didn't understand it.

Presiding Inspector: I don't understand it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you had any such experience with such blood [6255] clots on the question of whether they ever affect the mental processes?

Presiding Inspector: You mean before the stroke?

Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes. Before a stroke takes place.

Presiding Inspector: I suppose his blood clot lodges there within a very short time.

Mr. Grossman: Well, the Doctor hasn't testified to that. As a matter of fact, he testified that it probably began to form at the time he was previously in the hospital.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Didn't you, Doctor?

Presiding Inspector: And then at the time it became an embolism. An embolism is a floating body and it couldn't affect the brain until the embolism reached the brain.

The Witness: That's correct.

Presiding Inspector: That's elementary.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Could you state, Doctor, when you think was the first time that this fibrosis had developed in the brain?

A. We assume that it was in process of development ever since the previous time he had been hospitalized for heart disease.

Q. And when was that?

A. That was within a year or less; a few months. I can't give the dates exactly, because he was on another service and we don't remember those things very well. And in answer to [6256] your question, there would be no involvement of the patient's mental functions until the thrombosis took place, until the circulation was shut off, and after that many times there is no involvement of the mental capacity so far as thinking or reasoning or judgment is concerned. It depends on the area in which this embolus lodges.

Q. Well, was this in such an area that it could have affected the mental processes?

A. Well, it didn't in this case. This man was—after he came through the original shock of his

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

stroke he cleared and became conscious and was perfectly familiar with everything going on in his environment. He wasn't able to speak because it shut off the motor area, which is Broca's area; so-called "Broca's area". He couldn't talk, but he understood everything you said to him and he smiled appropriately. He appreciated the things that were being done for him. He was a very splendid patient.

Q. In layman's language, ultimately this stroke came from the fact that the blood vessels were closed off or one blood vessel was closed off in the brain or at least that participated, did it, in causing the stroke?

A. Yes. The left middle cerebral artery was occluded.

Presiding Inspector: That was the stroke?

The Witness: That was the thing that caused the stroke, yes.

Presiding Inspector: By the "stroke" you mean the—— [6257]

The Witness (Interposing): The lodging in of the embolus in this stream where the vessel was too small for it to go any farther. That's the thing that caused the stroke.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Is it possible that this occlusion or cutting off of the blood stream took place gradually; in other words, that it was cut off in parts for some time before it was completely cut off?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. Oh, no. In an embolic thrombosis it is a slow process in comparison with a man being shot, for instance. The shock will come, but he will continue to lose certain physical ability for probably hours after the first impact because, as the embolus lodges and shuts off the circulation, then all tissue, all brain tissue supplied by blood will almost, well, shortly be converted into fat and products of that kind. So that that particular area becomes a cavity rather than a mass of tissue as it had been before, and as the embolus in its lodgment interferes with the blood supply, coagulation takes place around the original embolus and it increases in size and, as it does, the clotting of the blood behind it backs up and involves other vessels leading away from this main artery, and then you have a wider field of an involvement than you did have when the original embolus struck. [6258]

Q. Have you stated all the physical conditions of Mr. Lovelace that contributed to his death, or were there others that contributed to some extent to his death?

A. We are quite satisfied that we have stated all of the causes of death.

Q. Was your diagnosis generally the same before the autopsy—I assume there was an autopsy?

A. Yes.

Q. Was your diagnosis generally the same before the autopsy as it was after it?

A. The same diagnosis before and after.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. What was the condition of Mr. Lovelace when he was first given his disability rating?

A. Well, I am not qualified to answer that question, your Honor, because we are not permitted to do it without his, or someone's consent. Unless his file was subpoenaed and brought into court I couldn't quote from it. I couldn't give—we are not permitted to answer that question. I am not permitted to answer that question, even if I knew it, but I don't know it.

Q. What was his condition so far as your examination disclosed at the time he was first given a disability rating?

A. I wouldn't answer for the same reason. I have covered practically all the things with reference to my examination in what I have already stated. [6259]

Q. You mean you don't remember what his condition was so far as disclosed by your examination when he was first given a disability rating?

A. He had a disability——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): That is not what the witness has stated.

Mr. Grossman: It may not be, but I am trying to clarify his reason.

Mr. Del Guercio: He has given his reason.

Presiding Inspector: I would like to hear the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

(Testimony of F. J. M Ernest.)

Presiding Inspector: I think that question is clear.

Mr. Del Guercio: He already explained what he testified to.

Presiding Inspector: I am not quite sure.

Mr. Del Guercio: Read the previous question and answer.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Grossman: When he stated the same reason as his previous answer, his previous answer was in part that he didn't know. I want to know whether it was for the same reason.

Presiding Inspector: He said he didn't know and couldn't [6260] testify at any rate, under the rules.

Mr. Grossman: I am concerned now with whether he remembers.

Presiding Inspector: He says——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): I don't think he has answered this because your Honor——

Presiding Inspector: Let me ask a question. Have you any recollection on the subject?

The Witness: Well, I haven't any recollection in detail, and apparently that is what he is trying to get me to say.

Presiding Inspector: You have such a recollection of his condition as any person dealing with him might have, a layman's recollection?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

The Witness: That is right.

Presiding Inspector: To which you apply your medical knowledge, of course?

The Witness: Well, if the records had been subpoenaed, your Honor, and they were here in Court, then I could testify accurately to all of the records and could give my findings, as well as the others—and especially I could give mine in detail—but we can't remember over a period of years—for instance, I can't tell you whether a man had neuritis in 1932, and paralysis in 1934. That is, I can't tell, give details about the things that we arrive at on our examination and remember them in detail to report [6261] on them years afterwards.

Mr. Grossman: Recognizing that his memory may not be as good as the records, I still think I am entitled to the witness' best recollection as to his condition as disclosed by his first examination of him. We are certainly not limited to the last examination.

Presiding Inspector: I think that you are entitled to that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. I want your best recollection, doctor, of the condition of Mr.——

A. (Interposing): As far as——

Q. (Continuing): I want your best recollection of the condition of Mr. Lovelace, as disclosed by your first examination of him.

A. My recollection of him there was that he was——

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Just a moment —if it is permitted under the rules of the Veterans' Administration.

Presiding Inspector: You produced this witness, the Government produced this witness. I will allow the question.

Mr. Del Guercio: Even if we did produce him——

Presiding Inspector: You produced him to show that he was not mentally affected.

Mr. Del Guercio: At the time prior to his death?

Presiding Inspector: At the time these various matters [6262] relate to. I will allow cross examination on that.

A. Well——

Presiding Inspector: Of course, if he comes in conflict with the rules he can state that; but he is asking for his recollection, if he has any.

A. Well, I remember Lovelace as a veteran, as a splendid sort of an individual who was quite bright and pleasant, efficient, intelligent, a kind of a fellow that was affable and knew what he was doing, and interested in everything going on about him. He was a conscientious sort of a chap, as I stated before. He had ideas of his own. He wasn't influenced too much by public opinion. He usually went into the subject in hand and familiarized himself with it and then made up his own mind and acted accordingly.

That was his picture when I first knew him, and that is his picture when I last knew him. There

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

had been no change in his type of personality in all the years I have known him.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Were there any neurological or psychiatric problems you discovered when you first examined him?

A. He never had any psychiatric problems in his case.

Q. How about neurological?

A. Well, that is the thing that I am not prepared to give in detail because I can't remember—I don't remember [6263] whether, as I said a while ago, whether he had neuritis, whether he had paralysis of the peripheral nerve, or whether he had some peculiar thing as a result of gunshot wounds that were reported in detail. I can't remember those things in detail.

Q. Do you remember whether, at the time you first examined him, there was any shell shock condition?

A. Oh, no. He wasn't the type of shell shock. He had a splendid army record. He saw action. He was the kind of a fellow that didn't boast about what he had been through but he never evaded anything. He was in touch with reality, and he was a real splendid citizen.

Q. Did you examine Mr. Lovelace more than any of the other doctors in the hospital, or did you just do your share in your specialty?

A. Oh, I just did my specialty.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. Do you remember whether you ever examined him on any occasion when he was not examined by doctors in all the other specialties that the hospital had?

A. You mean outside of the Veterans' Administration—no.

Q. In the Veterans' Administration—in other words, here is what I am driving at, Doctor!, You stated that when a patient came in for rating he was examined by doctors in the various specializations in the hospital? [6264] A. Yes.

Q. And as part of your specialized work you examined him. I want to know whether on any occasion you examined him when he was not examined by the doctors in the other specializations?

A. Now, I understand your question to be did I examine him as a neuro-psychiatrist for mental or nervous disturbances?

Q. No. That is not the question. The question is, did you ever examine him, not as part of a complete examination of all parts of him by all specialists?

A. When we make an examination our examination is independent of all others. We make a special examination. It is inclusive and conclusive as far as nervous and mental diseases are concerned.

Q. Was it true that whenever a man came in for examination as to his rating that he was examined as to every specialization or, rather, by every specialist from every field?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. No. A man comes in for rating purposes. He is examined by the man we call the General Examiner. Then he routes him around to the various specialists, according to his idea of what the man needs. If he has some definite service connected disability, something that has been rated or has been considered by the Legal Department and determined to be ratable, compensable, then always he will be examined [6265] by the specialist in that department.

If it was for paralysis of some sort he would come to me. If he had a service connected neuritis he would come to me. But if he had tuberculosis he would go to the T.B. specialist, or for heart disease he would be examined by the cardiac specialist—and for surgery and orthopedic things accordingly.

So the service connected disabilities are always examined by specialists and reported on for rating.

Q. Did Mr. Lovelace have a service connected disability? A. Yes.

Q. What was it?

A. I can't answer that question. I can't answer because I am not prepared to answer it.

Q. Was it in your specialized field?

A. No.

Q. Will you please explain then why, if the service connected disability of Mr. Lovelace, for which he came to the hospital for regular rating,

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

was not in your specialized field, why you examined him on each occasion?

A. He had gunshot wounds and as a result of gunshot wounds we have, in the areas involved, nerve supply which may at some time be active. For instance, a gunshot bullet or missile may be in the neighborhood of the peripheral nerve— [6266] by that I mean one of the nerves that comes out to the extremities after it leaves the neuro axis— and the missile may at times irritate the nerve and produce neuritis. As a result of his service connected gunshot wounds, or missile, which happens to be there, then the neuritis would also be service connected if it was present. At one examination it may be present and at another examination it isn't there, and he would be covered, that patient would be covered.

Q. Did Mr. Lovelace have neuritis?

A. Yes. He at times had involvement of the peripheral nerves, especially in—well, following his cardiac hospitalization treatment for his heart he had a good deal of trouble with his left brachial plexus, which means the nerves supply to the left upper extremity.

Q. Is neuritis within your specialization?

A. That is right.

Q. When was the first time that Mr. Lovelace developed any neuritis?

A. I can't answer that.

Q. To your knowledge?

A. I can't remember. How could I?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. Can you give me any kind of an estimate?

A. I really don't know. It may have been on the first occasion he came up in 1929 or 1930; and it may have been any other times in between. I don't know. [6267]

Q. Is it your statement, then, that—withdraw that. Is it correct that the only reason that you examined Mr. Lovelace was because of the presence or the possibility of neuritis?

Presiding Inspector: That isn't in accordance with his statement. He said it was routed to him.

Mr. Grossman: If he knows why he was routed to him he may say. I assume that the routing would indicate——

Presiding Inspector: You should have something shown about the routing.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Let's have the routing procedure. I assume it would be true that the routing, doctor, would give you some idea of the reason why a particular patient was being routed to you, is that correct?

A. That is usually the way.

Q. All right. And basing your answer on that knowledge which you received from the routing, Doctor, or any person who saw to it that Lovelace came to you for examination, will you state whether you ever examined Lovelace for any reason except neuritis, or the possibility of neuritis?

Mr. Myron: I object to that question, your Honor. He can ask him whether he received any or not.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Presiding Inspector: I will allow him to show it, if he can remember that.

A. I don't remember. [6268]

Presiding Inspector: Neuritis isn't the whole subject of the neurological field.

Mr. Grossman: It may be the only one that is traceable to the cause that Mr. Lovelace had.

Presiding Inspector: Maybe. He gave that, I suppose, as an example.

The Witness: That is correct.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you know why, on any occasion, Mr. Lovelace was routed to you?

A. You are asking me to answer a question that I have already told you that, without the records I couldn't give the details. I don't remember just the answer to the question that you now have propounded.

Q. Do you remember the reason on any occasion, however general, why Mr. Lovelace was routed to you?

A. Well, there isn't any question about why he was routed to me, when he came to the hospital this last time, because he came to my service direct. He was routed to me, or I was asked for a conference while he was being treated for heart disease, on account of his complaint of a pain in his left upper extremity, and especially his shoulder.

Q. Do you remember any other?

A. No. Those are in rather recent years and I remember those.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. What did you find to be the cause of the pain in [6269] the shoulder or upper extremity?

A. It was a lack of nourishment. In cardiac cases the circulation isn't so good and the nervous system, like the rest of the body, is not adequately supplied; and then you get your neurotic or your neuritic pains.

Q. Before you came down here did you read the hospital record on Lovelace, or any portion of it?

A. No. The only thing I read was the death certificate. The records have been sent to Washington, D. C. After the death of a veteran the files are closed and sent to the central office.

Q. Do you know when they were sent to Washington? A. After his death.

Q. Do you mean to say that there are no records remaining in the veterans' hospital in Portland as to the physical condition of Lovelace at any time?

A. Well, I asked for them, because I wanted to refresh my memory before I came down here. The manager was away. The Chief Medical officer knew of only the file of the death certificates. We keep a copy and that is the one I reviewed.

Q. Did you speak to any doctor in the hospital, or formerly in the hospital, with respect to the mental, with respect to the physical or mental condition of Lovelace before coming down here?

A. You mean to help refresh my memory, or something like that? [6270]

Q. For any purpose?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Mr. Del Guercio: For any purpose? You mean for any purpose connected with Lovelace?

Presiding Inspector: Yes; certainly.

Mr. Grossman: I assume it would be connected with him.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

The Witness: May I have the question again?

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Before coming down here did you speak to any physician about the physical or mental condition of Lovelace at any time?

A. Oh, well——

Q. (Interposing): I mean in the last, let us say, two or three months?

A. He died the 13th day of March—April, May, June—that is two or three months—his case came before the staff conference after death, who had the laboratory studies with the microscopic projection of slides, and the specimen examination, and that was shown to the whole staff, the case was presented to the whole staff. That is just one of the routine things we do with cases of this kind.

But I talked to no one.

Presiding Inspector: Did you demonstrate something there on the slides?

The Witness: Yes, sir. The slides—and a picture [6271] was graphically portrayed of exactly what I have told you.

Presiding Inspector: You see there was talk of that kind.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. After that time, when you had conferences in order to fix the cause of death, have you discussed Lovelace's physical or mental condition with any decor?

A. Well, when I spoke to the Chief Medical Officer asking him for the records to refresh my memory, we discussed, oh, just comments like one doctor would do to another, in regard to Lovelace; and the fact that when he came there on the 20th of February he practically was—I believe the remark was that he was practically the same as dead, except that he knew what was going on. He was conscious. He wasn't able to move or talk. It was just that sort of conversation. There wasn't anything with reference to his physical or mental condition.

Q. Was that the only discussion you have had with any doctors? A. Yes.

Q. Since the cause of death was finally fixed at your conference——

A. (Interposing): The cause of death was fixed by autopsy—it was verified.

Q. When was the discussion you had with this doctor is the hospital? [6272]

A. Dr. Brace—the C.M.O.—that would be on Saturday morning. I left on Sunday.

Q. Last Saturday?

A. This last Saturday.

Q. When was the first time you made any inquiry to see if there were any medical records in the hospital on Richard Lovelace?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

A. That Saturday morning.

Q. Do you recall where the medical history of Mr. Lovelece's, as given by him to you, or obtained from any other source——

Presiding Inspector: When he first came, you mean?

Mr. Grossman: At any time.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. (Continuing): ——contained any facts or alleged facts that caused you to investigate as to whether there was any psychiatric problem there?

A. All history is of record and when a man has been examined in one facility and transferred to another, or if he moves about, all his records go with him. And when we made our first examination we had all of the records that had been made before, ever since his application for compensation, and we considered all those records, as well as the history he gave us, at the time of our examination in arriving at our own conclusions.

Presiding Inspector: Are you testifying from general [6273] routine or from your memory of this particular case?

The Witness: That is general routine.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember anything in the history that caused you to investigate as to whether there was any psychiatric problems?

A. There wasn't anything in his history that I recall that indicated that he had ever had any nervous or mental—I mean, mental sickness.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. Temporary or permanent?

A. I don't recall anything either temporary or permanent.

Q. Now, is it your best recollection that you never examined Mr. Lovelace except when he was being examined for a rating, or for a possible change in the rating, or when he was in the hospital because of his cardiac condition, or when he came to the hospital because of the stroke?

A. I have no recollection of ever making any examination.

Q. Did you have any contact with Mr. Lovelace outside of the medical contact you have related in the hospital? A. Oh, yes.

Q. What was that other contact?

A. Well, I have been on the Executive Board of Post 1, American Legion, Portland, Oregon, for a number of years. In 1937 he came before the Executive Board in an effort to get [6274] back to the American Legion. We discussed the situation but when the minutes of the Executive Board were read on the Post floor, floor of the Post, they wouldn't permit him to come back. Dick was at that meeting. The Legionnaires weren't very careful about how—they stated that he had been a Communist and "Once a Communist, always a Communist," or something to that effect, and they didn't want him in our Post.

That is when I began to know him best and from then on I have more or less been in close contact with him inside and outside of the hospital.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

He was not admitted. We didn't accept him.

I think it was in 1939, because he was recommended by members of our Post who had special things to do with the subversive activities, he was considered by the Executive Board again and was admitted. Since that time he had been an active member of Post 1, American Legion.

I now am Second Vice Commander of the Post, and, as I said, I have been on the Executive Board for years before that. I had something to do with getting him back into the Legion because he has been—since he has come back he has been a very good Legionnaire and he has been attending meetings regularly. We meet every Monday night. At the same time he has been working on the various committees. He was Chairman of the Committee, active manager of a Committee to put on the [6275] Greek Relief, in which we invested some $2000, and he had charge of that and was working on that at the time of his death.

Q. Doctor, did you participate as a pallbearer, or honorary pallbearer, at his funeral?

A. Occasionally.

Q. I say, at his funeral?

A. No. I thought you asked that as a general question. For instance, I was an honorary pallbearer at a funeral here just recently in Portland.

Q. Did your Post provide funeral ceremony?

A. They did.

Q. For Mr. Lovelace? A. They did; yes.

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Q. You are sure you weren't one of the honorary pallbearers?

A. I wasn't a pallbearer at all.

Q. I mean in the sense—I assume the honorary pallbearers don't carry anything.

Presiding Inspector: You mean his name was published in the newspaper?

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. There was a printed program put out for this funeral ceremony?

A. I can't answer that. I know I wasn't at his funeral.

Presiding Inspector: You know it is like places where [6276] there are going to be speeches—the announcements are not always carried out.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: People's names are posted in the newspapers, as well as honorary pallbearers, when they haven't been there.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. At least, you have a recollection of that?

Presiding Inspector: I think the Examiner would take judicial notice of that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. At least, you weren't at the funeral, that is definite? A. No.

Q. Did you ever have any social contact with Mr. Lovelace outside of the activities of the Legion Post? A. No. [6277]

Q. Now, you have described the mental condi-

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

tion of Mr. Lovelace, I have forgotten the terms you used, but you used such terms as "intelligent"——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): The record will show what terms the Doctor used.

Mr. Grossman: I understand. I am not changing them by restating them.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you have the same views with respect to the mental condition of Mr. Lovelace at any time when you knew that he was an active Communist?

A. Yes, for the reasons that I gave. He was one of those—he was a well educated chap and he had the faculty of going into things, and if you asked him why—in fact, at that appearance at the Post when they turned him down he explained why he got into the Communist Party and the difficulty he had in getting out. And it was a very instructive talk he made. He was a very intelligent sort.

Q. Did you as a psychiatrist consider that he gave a rational explanation of why he went into the Communist Party?

A. Yes, I certainly do. He said that the constitution and by-laws and the preamble or the creed, or whatever it is upon which Communism was based, was ideal for the human race and he didn't hesitate in giving a lot of reasons why. That was his statement when he went in, and his statement that the reason he went out was that, while that was the foundation [6278] of it, so far as he was concerned

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

he found out that it was a racket and that was his explanation for getting out.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, at the present time we have completed our cross examination. It may be that we have absolutely finished it. At the same time, since we naturally didn't know that Doctor Ernest would testify—we would like some chance to check our records. We can do it without inconveniencing the Court if we adjourn fifteen minutes earlier and reconvene fifteen minutes earlier. We, therefore, would like the opportunity of continuing our cross examination after lunch and adjourn now.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is unusual.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, I don't think that is very unusual. But do you want to re-examine him any further?

Mr. Del Guercio: Not at all.

Presiding Inspector: Have you another witness that you can put on?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. We won't break in for ten minutes.

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps I'll decide that.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps I'll decide that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I meant that, of course. We don't want to.

Presiding Inspector: But I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have a matter, however, that I would [6279] like to take up at this time.

Presiding Inspector: In chambers?

(Testimony of F. J. M. Ernest.)

Mr. Del Guercio: No; right here in Court.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. You are excused for a moment, but don't go because they want to examine you at a quarter of two, perhaps.

(Witness temporarily excused.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have here a——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): Just one thing. Is it understood, Doctor Ernest, that—Doctor, you understand that we would like to have you back at two o'clock?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, he understands.

Doctor Ernest: Yes. The Judge just informed me.

Presiding Inspector: A quarter of two.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, a quarter of two.

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you through?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, I am through.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have here an affidavit from Virgil MacMickle in which he transmits a photostatic copy of certain diplomas. I offer this in evidence.

Mr. Grossman: We have no objection.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 287.) [6280]

Mr. Del Guercio: And I want to call the Court's attention to Virgil MacMickle's diplomas. The Court recalls his testimony regarding the diplomas he received and the places he received them.

Presiding Inspector: I remember that.

Mr. Del Guercio: There is one here, a diploma from the Stanhope High School, a photostatic copy. The next one is a diploma from—what purports to be a diploma from the American School of Naturopathy, Incorporated, 1905 under the laws of the State of New York, reading as follows:——

Mr. Gladstein (Interposing): Is it necessary that it be read?

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I think it is very important in view of the testimony given by MacMickle.

Presiding Inspector: Counsel wants to point out something to the Presiding Examiner. I will allow him to do it because we have done this all the way through.

Mr. Del Guercio: Because of the volume of the Exhibits here I am afraid that the Court will not have time to look over each of the Exhibits.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, I shan't read all the Exhibits.

Mr. Del Guercio: "Be it known to all to whom this presents shall come that Virgil MacMickle has received the full theoretical and practical course of instruction in all of the Branches of the Science of Naturopathy".

You will recall MacMickle's testimony that he attended [6281] that school in New York for just a period of six months, not longer than six months, and took a Post Graduate course.

"As prescribed by the Faculty of the American School of Naturopathy and Graduated with Honor

in consideration of the high degree of ability attained, the American School of Naturopathy does by this instrument certify him to be a competent Naturopathy and commend him to public favor", signed by Benedict Lust, N.D., M. D. and Wm. F. Havard, N.D.

This is signed and sealed by the American School of Naturopathy, the 20th day of June, 1913.

The next one is a diploma from the MacFadden College of Physcultopathy. I don't know if I can pronounce that or not. I understand that that is physical education.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know.

Mr. Del Guercio: "Physcultopathy".

Presiding Inspector: I am not familiar with the word.

Mr. Del Guercio: "Physcultopathy".

Presiding Inspector: I am also unfamiliar with that word.

Mr. Del Guercio: Chicago, Illinois.

You will recall Mr. MacMickle's testimony. He said he attended the American College of Drugless Physicians in Chicago, Illinois for about two years.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I recall the testimony. [6282]

Mr. Del Guercio: And this reads: "To all to whom this writing may come, Greetings.

"Be it known that Virgil MacMickle having successfully completed the Post-Graduate course of Study of this College and having complied with all other requirements for graduation from this Insti-

tution has been declared a Doctor of Physcultopathy", and signed by, among others, Frederic S. Goodrich, D.D., which I suppose is Doctor of Divinity. I don't know. And John G. Speicher. I can't make the initials out there, and another person.

Presiding Inspector: You may have it marked in evidence. We will take a recess until——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Sir? I have a few more documents on this.

Presiding Inspector: All right.

Mr. Del Guercio: The Court will recall that MacMickle testified that he was authorized to call himself a Doctor by virtue of the diploma received from this American School of Naturopathy.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have here, and I offer it in evidence, under the seal of the State Department of Education, the State of New York, reading as follows:

"I, J. Hillis Miller, Associate Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, do hereby certify that an examination of the records of this Department does not reveal [6283] that the American College of Naturopathy was ever incorporated by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York; that said college was not in 1910 or subsequent thereto a recognized college in the State of New York.

"The records further reveal that Benedict Lust and Virgil MacMickle have not been licensed to practice medicine in the State of New York. No

person unless licensed may legally practice medicine in such state.

"I further certify that the degree of 'Doctor of Naturopathy' does not appear among the degrees in course or the honorary degrees approved by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York.

"In witness whereof", the usual affidavit.

Mr. Gladstein: We object to the offer and we move that that portion which was read into the record be stricken upon the ground that the document offered is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial and no proper foundation has been laid for its introduction in evidence, and it is also hearsay on which no possible cross examination——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): It is an official document. As a matter of fact, all educational institutions—I happen to know and I suppose you would be willing that I should take judicial notice of the laws of the State of New York.

Mr. Grossman: That is correct. [6284]

Mr. Gladstein: We have no objection to your taking judicial notice of the laws.

Presiding Inspector: All educational institutions must be incorporated under the Regents.

Mr. Grossman: Has that always been true?

Presiding Inspector: I think so, ever since I practiced law.

Mr. Grossman: Because we are dealing with a period back—what is it? 1911.

Presiding Inspector: I was admitted in '95.

Mr. Gladstein: We renew our objection to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it. But you may, of course, attack it by any reference to the laws or anything of that kind or any regulations of the Regents of the University or any department in the State of New York.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 288.)

Presiding Inspector: We accept those certificates in relation to colleges even outside of the State of New York.

Mrs. King: We have no objection to your taking judicial notice of the fact that the school was not incorporated under those laws, but the fact is that what knowledge Doctor MacMeikle had of the situation is another problem. [6285]

Presiding Inspector: Oh, that doesn't appear, of course. That doesn't establish that he had any knowledge.

Mrs. King: Yes, and that is the reason we regard it as immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I don't suppose that he has to take judicial notice.

Mr. Del Guercio: Before I offer these I want to call the Court's attention to the fact that MacMickle, when he appeared on the stand here, testified that he did not know that Doctor Lust—Benedict Lust had been convicted of unlawfully issuing degrees. I have a number of certified copies of convictions of Doctor Lust for publishing advertise-

ments relating to venereal disease, two of them for unlawfully conferring a degree.

Mr. Gladstein: We object to all those as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I don't suppose Doctor Lust's character is in question, if he is "Doctor" Lust. I will exclude those.

Mr. Del Guercio: He is in question. Everything MacMickle claims to be he got from Doctor Benedict Lust.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: So we go to the source to see the sources.

Presiding Inspector: You have made the offer. You may [6286] have them marked for identification.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer them for identification.

Presiding Inspector: I won't receive them in evidence.

(The documents referred to were marked Government's Exhibit No. 289 for identification.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I have just one other document, your Honor.

You will recall another witness—I don't believe he was a character witness—that the Defense called, a Charles A. Yeoman. That's the man here that was in doubt as to whether he had married a girl the first time.

Presiding Inspector: Was his name "Yeoman"?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yeoman; Charles A. Yeoman.

Presiding Inspector: Are these records of conviction?

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: Are these records of conviction?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. It is a record of conviction. He testified that he was not convicted of a felony in the State of Oregon.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I remember that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am not speaking about the other charge here in Los Angeles. This is a charge in Oregon.

Mr. Gladstein: Are these the same?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, we wonder about this question. [6287] This is a conviction that Mr. Yeoman admitted. I don't think in any sense this is inconsistent with the admission he made on the stand. That being true, if it is,—and I think very definitely it is—then we think this is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: It would only be——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): Confirmatory as a statement.

Presiding Inspector (Continuing): ——confirmatory and perhaps it is a little fuller than his statement.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will receive it. It is one, isn't it? Just one conviction?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, in Portland.

(The document referred to was received in

evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 290.)

Mr. Del Guercio: As I recall Yeoman's testimony in that connection, he said that he was convicted of petty larceny or petty theft.

Mr. Grossman: Maybe it is petty larceny. There is no way of knowing. It is called "larceny" and it gives the amount. Unless we look at the statutes in Oregon we wouldn't know.

Presiding Inspector: Those sums are different in different statutes.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Del Guercio: I now offer in evidence a certified [6288] copy of conviction in the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for the County of Multnomah in the case of The State of Oregon vs. Charles A. Yeoman.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I think there was a little doubt in his mind as to the sum.

Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Presiding Inspector: So that this will explain that at least.

Mr. Del Guercio: I desire to call the Court's attention to the fact that this document shows that Charles A. Yeoman was accused of the crime of larceny, by information filed in the Municipal Court for the City of Portland, County of Multnomah, State of Oregon, and having appeared before the Honorable Robert Tucker, Judge of the above-entitled Court, and waived indictment therefor, the undersigned, District Attorney for the County of Multnomah, State of Oregon, files this Information

against the said Charles A. Yeoman, and charges him with the crime of larceny, committed as follows:

"The said Charles A. Yeoman on the 14th day of September, A.D., 1935, in the City of Portland, County of Multnomah, State of Oregon, then and there being, did then and there unlawfully and feloniously take, steal and carry away certain personal property, to-wit:——"

And then it won't be necessary to read that.

". . . . of the total aggregate value of $278.00, contrary to the statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the [6289] peace and dignity of the State of Oregon".

Presiding Inspector: Is there anything else before recess?

Mr. Del Guercio: No.

Presiding Inspector: We will take a recess until a quarter to two.

(Whereupon at 12:25 o'clock P.M. an adjournment was taken until 1:45 o'clock P.M. of the same day.) [6290]

After Recess
1:40 o'clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

Mr. Grossman: We have no further questions of Dr. Ernest.

Presiding Inspector: Then the Doctor is excused unless——

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio entered the hearing room.)

Presiding Inspector: I beg your pardon. They said they have no further questions of Dr. Ernest, and unless you have some questions of the Doctor he is excused.

Mr. Del Guercio: No, I have not.

Presiding Inspector: You are excused, Doctor. Next witness?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment.

(Witness excused.)

MAURICE J. CANNALONGA

called as a witness in rebuttal on behalf of the Government, having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:

Presiding Inspector: You have been sworn?

The Witness: I have.

Presiding Inspector: You continue under the oath.

The Witness: I do.

Presiding Inspector: Anything you say is under the oath already given.

The Witness: Yes. [6291]

Direct Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What is your name?

A. Maurice J. Cannalonga.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Are you the same Maurice J. Cannalonga who appeared in this proceeding here and have given testimony? A. I am.

Q. Now, Mr. Cannalonga, do you remember the testimony you gave here in this court the last time you appeared here? A. I do.

Q. Was all that testimony true and correct?

A. It is.

Q. Now, when did you complete testifying in this case, the last time, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. It was on a Thursday.

Q. On April 17, do you recall? A. Yes.

Q. 1941? A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell the Court what happened after you completed testifying here, starting from the time you left the stand?

A. Well, I left here and caught a train back to Seattle—I think it was an Express—and I got to Seattle on Friday evening about 8:00 o'clock. Then I went out to the [6292] house.

The next morning I went down to the union hall to register. I got down there and went in there and saw the business agent. He looked at me—his name was Burt Cole—and he said, "You got yourself in a pretty bad spot."

I said, "Yes, I believe I have."

He says, "Well, anyway, I have got a good job for you. I want you to take it."

I didn't intend to ship. I was going to wait for my old ship, the Clevdon. The Chief Engineer and

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

the Ship's Delegate had made arrangements for me to go back on it.

He said, "We are in kind of a spot now. Charlie got off the West Cussetta in Victoria to go out on one of the new ships."

Charlie is another electrician.

So I said, "Well, I don't want to ship." I says, "I will see you Monday. I will think it over and see you Monday."

He said, "Well, think it over pretty serious because we can't get electricians for the ships, and we want you to take this for we know you can handle it."

So I went down Monday morning and he got ahold of me and he says, "We are in a tough spot, Blackie. We have got to have a man and we can't get no electricians. How about taking it?"

I said, "O.K., I will take it." I said. "As soon as I [6293] can get relief later on I will quit it."

Q. On what ship was that?

A. The West Cussetta.

Q. The West Cussetta?

A. Yes, a Maritime Commission Ship.

Q. And that was lying in Portland at the time?

A. No, Seattle.

Q. In Seattle?

A. In Seattle, yes. Well, you want a brief outline.

Q. Yes, sure. A. O. K.

Presiding Inspector: Go right ahead. He inter-

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

rupted to have it straightened out in some way something about which he was in doubt.

A. (Continuing): Ah, uh-huh (Affirmative). Let's see. Then——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You said you would take if.

A. (Continuing): I took the job and I went down aboard ship and reported to the Chief Engineer and then asked him if I could get off in the afternoon about two o'clock so I could go down and see the Draft Board as I hadn't taken a physical examination yet and I had been notified on the East Coast and again in Portland just before I came down to testify.

And he said "O. K." And I went down and saw the Draft Board and tried to make arrangements with them to get a physical [6294] examination right then. And they said, "Come back Wednesday."

Well, on Wednesday the ship was in Tacoma and then from there. from Tacoma we went down to Portland and we got to Portland and a longshoreman came aboard to load cargo, and my job was electrician's, checking up on electric winches and seeing that everything was in proper shape.

I met quite a few longshoremen that I knew and they wanted to know why I testified against Bridges and I told them that I testified mainly against the Communist Party and what it stood for. And then I think that's the day Craycraft came aboard on a Thursday, yes.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Let me interrupt you there. When did the West Cussetta arrive in Portland, do you remember?

A. I believe it was Thursday.

Q. Thursday. Was that May the——

A. (Interposing): Thursday or Friday.

Q. April 30th, is that correct?

A. May the 30th, yes.

Q. April 30th?

A. April 30th. Correct. And, oh, there was quite a few fellows that came aboard ship and asked me the same question why I testified against Bridges. And I think it was three or four days later that Crayeraft came aboard. He had some meeting on a Friday to go to. I think it was an Executive Board meeting of some sort, and, well, anyway he talked to me. And the [6295] first thing he said that down in San Francisco he heard that the FBI had a Mann Act charge against me and that I had transported a woman from Reno, I believe, to Seattle. And I looked at him and I says "Christ! You're crazy!"

So, anyway, he talked a while and he said he had to go and he had this meeting to go to and he would be back later on that night. So as he was leaving the gangway another fellow stopped him and asked Crayeraft—he says "What's the status of Cannalonga?" And Crayeraft says "Just hold everything up."

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

"Well," he says, "The members want to know," because if I am not mistaken that same day a picture of me appeared in the Voice of the Federation as a stool pigeon and labor spy. So I was kind of burned up over it. So he said he would come back that night and, well, he came back that night and there was a couple of fellows in the room drinking with me. We had a bottle of rum out and some Coca Cola and I gave him a drink and he called me aside. He says "Well," he says "I want to talk to you." He says "I don't want to talk to you in front of a bunch of fellows and I don't want to be seen on the ship."

So I told him "Well, I have got a little work to do back in the shop. If you want to come back there you can go ahead and come back and talk to me while I am working."

So he says "OK." And we got back in the shop and he mentioned that Bridges couldn't understand why I appeared against him and that he was worried over me and said that the FBI had [6296] some kind of a hold on me. And at the time I told him, I says, "No, they didn't have anything on me." So well, he said he was leaving, that Gladstein would be up on the following day, Saturday, and he wanted to talk to me. And I says "Well, I don't want to see Gladstein."

"Well," he says, "You should talk to him. They are worried about you down in 'Frisco."

And so I says "Yes, I would like to see him and have him explain to me in regards to the piece that

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

appeared in the Voice of the Federation and that they had already started a campaign against me in the papers being a stool pigeon and a labor spy."

And so he says he will see me on the following day. And the following day, Saturday, which was my birthday—so I started hitting the bottle in the morning doing a little celebrating and had some of the fellows aboard ship in for a drink or so. Then I think it was around three o'clock that I met Craycraft. I am not sure of the exact time, and most of what so-called happened up in that hotel room—I am still hazy as the devil of what was said or done up there.

By Mr. DeGuercio:

Q. Where were you when you met Craycraft on Saturday?

A. I think he came aboard ship and we walked out to the car or I went out to the dock and met him. [6297]

Q. Well, did he tell you where he wanted to take you?

A. Yes. He said he was going to take me up to see Gladstein.

Q. And do you know where he took you?

A. Yes. I think it was the Clyde Hotel.

Q. Clyde Hotel. And where in the Clyde Hotel did he take you?

A. That's in Portland.

Q. No. Where? Did he take you to a room in the Clyde Hotel?

A. Yes, in the hotel room.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. And who was in the room when you arrived there?

A. I think just Gladstein, Craycraft and myself.

Q. Now, will you tell us what happened in that room? What was the first thing that was said when you met—is this the Gladstein that you mean here?

A. Yes, that's the Gladstein. (Indicating)

Q. What was the first thing that happened when you saw Gladstein?

A. Let's see now.

Q. That you remember.

A. I remember—it is still vague as hell in my mind. I remember one instance where I think I brought up in regards to the Voice of the Federation, and another one where he said they had the backing of Murray and Lewis and political backing and [6298] physical backing.

Q. Who said that, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. I don't know whether it was Gladstein or Craycraft. I think it was Craycraft.

Q. Well now, will you repeat that again? What was said?

A. Well, they said that they had financial backing and backing of Lewis and the CIO and Murray, and that they had physical backing also.

Q. And that was said by either Mr. Gladstein here——

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing) ——or Craycraft?

A. Or Craycraft.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Or, in any event, it was said in the presence of Mr. Gladstein? A. Yes.

Q. That is in Mr. Gladstein's hotel room there in Portland, Oregon? A. Yes. [6299]

Q. Will you proceed and tell us, please, what else happened in Mr. Gladstein's hotel room?

A. I believe we were in the room about an hour, and I left and went back to the ship. I got back to the ship and the first one I met—I went in a room and was in this room a while and had a couple of more drinks, and I came out and the first—I was going into the salon for dinner—and the first man I met in the passageway was the Purser, and he said, "I don't know how in the hell you can walk around," he says, "with that load you are carrying but, God damn, you sure can do your work," or words to that effect.

I beg your pardon for the swearing.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead. We can stand it.

A. (Continuing) I said, "Well, as far as the job is concerned," I says, "I know my job and I have been putting in some pretty long hours." In fact it was from, I believe 59 hours overtime, besides my regular eight hours a day the first week, and 58 or so the second week, and I was pretty well pooped out; in other words, you know, from lack of sleep and—well, you can't exactly explain it. You have to go through the same thing yourself to understand it.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did Craycraft go back with you, from Gladstein's hotel room, to the ship?

A. Yes, he did. In fact, he stopped—I had him pick me [6300] up a bottle. I didn't have one of those—what you call it?—Liquor permits. I didn't have a liquor permit so he got me a bottle of Government House rum, and I got half a dozen bottles of Coca Cola.

Q. Did he come on board the ship with you?

A. Yes; he came aboard ship. I gave him a drink.

Q. How long did he remain on the ship?

A. That I couldn't recall.

Q. Will you tell us, proceed from that point on?

A. Well, they worked cargo that night.

Q. Were you working that night?

A. Yes. As luck would have it, nothing broke down either. So I was all right.

Just as they knocked off, I think it was nine o'clock or so, one of these winches did go haywire and I got up—I had went to sleep—and I think I got up at three o'clock in the morning.

Q. That was Sunday morning?

A. Sunday morning—I had the night Mate wake me up at three o'clock to fix the winch; otherwise I never would have been able to fix it.

After I got it fixed, my head was a little big so I started in again and started to do some more drinking.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did you meet anybody on this Sunday morning, that is, either Mr. Craycraft or any other longshoreman? [6301]

A. I think Craycraft came down that morning and wanted to know if I could get off.

Q. Look, Mr. Cannalonga, let's go back to this hotel room when you were with Craycraft and Gladstein here. Do you remember anything being said about Gladstein wanting to see you again either that day or the next day?

A. I believe so. I am not sure. It is hazy.

Q. What do you recall as to whether any arrangement was made to see you again?

A. (Pause).

Q. Just your best recollection. If you don't remember, say you don't know.

A. I don't believe I remember.

Q. Then you saw Craycraft on Sunday?

A. Yes. I think I did Sunday morning some time. He said something about calling him up at a grocery store when I could get off.

Q. Did you call him up?

A. I believe I did; yes, I did.

Q. And then what happened? Did you meet Craycraft?

A. I went out on the dock, to the dock office and called up; yes. Then I remember I went back to the ship and got another drink, and then I went out on the dock and went outside there, and he came along in a car and picked me up.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Was anybody with Craycraft when he picked you up [6302] that Sunday morning?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Where did he take you?

A. I believe we went up to the Clyde Hotel and I remember yes, we went up to the Clyde Hotel.

Q. Who did you meet at the Clyde Hotel?

A. It was Gladstein up there again.

Q. In his, Gladstein's room?

A. Yes, in his room, and Craycraft.

Q. Did you have any conversation there in Gladstein's room that Sunday?

A. I believe we did have some kind of an argument and I believe the outcome of the argument, either one of them said, "Well, what are you afraid of"?

I said, "Nothing."

I think I told Craycraft if he wanted to work me over he could at the time.

You see, it is pretty hazy. I wouldn't want to swear that I did and didn't—you know, after all, things like that, when you are not sure.

I think we did get in a car and started for some place.

Q. Who; you, Gladstein and Craycraft?

A. Yes.

Q. You went out of the hotel room and got into a car? A. Yes. [6303]

Q. Where did you go?

A. I remember going into the elevator; I remember that part of it, going into some building;

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

and into some room where there was three or four other people in there.

Q. Was Gladstein there?

A. Well, he must have been; he was with me.

Q. Was Craycraft there?

A. Yes; I am quite sure he was.

Q. Did you know anybody who was there?

A. No. Some lawyer—some lawyer's office, if I am not mistaken.

Q. What took place in this office?

A. Well, as far as I can remember, I remember being out in the hallway and Craycraft was out there and asked me to go back in.

I said, "No. Why should I go back in there? What are you guys trying to pull?"

And then I went into the toilet and I think I heaved a little. Then I came back out again and went back in the lawyer's office. And there was mentioned something about the Mann Act, and I turned around and walked out on them.

He came out again and asked me to come back.

Q. Who came out?

A. Craycraft. I says, "No, I am going down to the ship."

I went back down to the ship. Then I got aboard ship [6304] and had some supper.

That night I believe Craycraft or Mowery, one of them, came down and—the whole thing is hazy as the devil.

Q. Do the best you can.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Yes, I am trying to. Anyway, I got back aboard ship.

Q. Did you see Craycraft, you say?

A. I believe so, I am not quite sure.

Q. You say Mowery might have come down there? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know who Mowery is?

A. Yes; I know Jack Mowery.

Q. How long have you known him?

A. I knew him, met him during the 1936-1937 strike in Portland.

Q. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

A. He wasn't then; no.

Q. Was he later? A. I don't know.

Q. Then what happened? Did Craycraft say anything to you that Sunday on the ship after you left the lawyer's office?

A. Oh, I believe he wanted me to go back and see Gladstein again, and I wouldn't do it.

Then the following day there was quite a few fellows that [6305] came aboard to see me.

Q. That was Monday?

A. Yes, Monday—and I do know Monday night Craycraft and Mowery was aboard ship and Craycraft wanted me to write a note to Harry and stating I would be down there, and stating I would be down to see him.

I told him that I didn't want to write a note. I said, "What for"?

He said, "We will take you down and you can talk to Harry and kind of straighten things out."

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

I said, "No."

He said, "Well, why don't you write a note anyway. It will make him feel better."

I said, "O.K. I will write a note."

I wrote what he told me to write. Then he asked me to sign my name and I signed it "Blackie," which is my nickname.

He said, "What do you sign it that way for"?

I says, "That is good enough. He will know who wrote it."

He said, "You should sign your name."

I said, "No, let it stand that way as 'Blackie'."

Q. Who asked you to write a note to Bridges?

A. Craycraft. Then I think I went and made some sandwiches. I had a bottle and we were drinking out of it. I think I went to the pantry and made up a half a dozen sandwiches and brought them back in. [6306]

On the ship they have a night lunch for the crew and you just go and help yourself and make these sandwiches. When anybody comes, you see, regardless of who it is, you always play host to them.

And then I believe—oh, yes—when I got down to Portland I think I had been there about a week and I had called up the hall asking them to get me a man to relieve me, for the job was getting me down. I was putting in too long hours. I had just gotten off a ship. So they said they would do their best, and as soon as they could get a man I could quit the job and then go back up to Seattle. I wanted to go

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

back up to Seattle and go to a place of mine out on Hood Canal.

Well, they couldn't get a relief and, I believe, Monday night they mentioned—— [6307]

Q. Did you tell Crayeraft what you were doing, that you were trying to get off the ship?

A. Oh, yes. He knew that. In fact, the Chief Engineer I notified him, and the port engineer previous to that and they didn't want me to leave the ship, and they claim I have been the best electrician they ever had on there. But I told them that the job was too much, that I was putting in too long hours and the ship was in pretty bum shape.

So then it was either Jack or Rosco Crayeraft suggested that if I was going to Seattle they would give me a ride up. They had to go up anyway. And so I worked Tuesday and I think I left the ship Wednesday morning.

Q. Mr. Cannalonga, before you proceed any further I want to show you here Alien's Exhibit 24 and ask you if that is the note you wrote and signed "Blackie"? A. That's it.

Q. And to whom was that to be addressed or to whom were you told that that was being addressed?

A. I think he said Harry Bridges.

Q. Crayeraft did? A. Yes.

Q. And is that all in your handwriting?

A. Yes, that is my handwriting.

Q. And you gave this to who?

A. Crayeraft.

Q. To give to whom? [6308]

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. I don't know.

Q. Well now, you say on this Monday here before you saw Craycraft again four or five longshoremen came aboard the ship to see you?

A. Yes, there was quite a few of them.

Q. What did they say?

A. They all mentioned the same thing, why I testified against Bridges.

Q. Now, were there any longshoremen employed on the ship that also asked you the same thing?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. How many of them?

A. Oh, Christ! About half the longshoremen on the ship.

Q. Now, did you see anybody else Monday night?

A. Yes. I think there was somebody else. I had been working and doing something and I had just gotten—how was that? Oh, I was—yes, I was taking a little nip in a room and this fellow showed up and he said he was Chairman of the Defense Committee, Bridges, and he wanted to know why I testified against Bridges.

Q. Had you ever seen him before?

A. No, I don't believe I have.

Q. Did he tell you his name?

A. I believe he did. [6309]

Q. Was it Rodman?

A. Yes, something like that.

Q. And he said he was from the Bridges Defense Committee? A. Yes.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. What did he say as far as you can remember of what he said? Will you tell us all that he said?

A. All that he said? Well, he mentioned he was surprised that I appeared against Bridges and they all figured that the FBI had something on me and they were holding the rap over my head. And I told them, I says "No, they have never had anything on me. In fact, my record is as clean as a whistle." And I pointed out—I don't know whether it was him or Craycraft—that they could trace where I had been and what I had done from back to 1927 right to this day.

Q. What had you been doing from 1937?

A. '27.

Q. '27 to the present time?

A. Well, in 1927 I put a year in the Coast Guard and then in '28 I had been on the American Pioneer Steamship Company out of New York and we were gone about a year, and then on the West Coast, '29, I was on various tankers and then I was on various Dollar Steamship vessels and American Mail Line ships, and then I got off of one of the Dollar boats in '34 and went out on strike; was on strike all during the 1934 strike in San Francisco. And then I shipped on one of the [6310] States Line Ships to the East Coast; made a trip to the East Coast and got off—that was right after the '34 strike, and——

Q. (Interposing): Let me put it this way, Mr. Cannalonga. From 1927 until the present time have you ever been on the beach long enough to have taken a trip around the United States overland?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. No. You see, in the first place, from '34 on we have what we call a shipping register and to ship out of that particular port you have to go on the shipping list and you register and then you have to go to meetings every two weeks. Otherwise, if you don't do that you go on the bottom of the list and you can't ship unless you do register in the union hall. You see, we have complete control over hiring.

Q. And your record there is available?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. As to what you have done from the time——

A. (Interposing): Oh, yes. From 1935 to the present.

Q. Now, have you ever been in Nevada?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been to Reno, Nevada?

A. No. In fact, I have never been off the coast states.

Q. By the coast states you mean Washington——

A. (Interposing): Washington, Oregon and California. I have never been in any of the inland states.

Q. Did your ever go across the country overland? [6311] A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Let us say from Massachusetts to the West Coast here.

A. No.

Q. Or the other way around? A. No.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. You were born in Massachusetts, weren't you? A. I was.

Q. You say that every time you went from the East Coast to the West Coast or from the West Coast to the East Coast you went by ship?

A. By steamship.

Q. And you have never been in any of the states in the West other than the coast states?

A. No.

Q. Now, let's see. To go back to this Monday night, that is the day following your conversation with Mr. Gladstein and Craycraft.

A. Uh-huh (Affirmative).

Q. And now you were at the point where Craycraft had seen you the Monday night, is that right?

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Now, what happened Tuesday, the following day? [6312]

A. I think that's the day I quit the ship.

Q. What?

A. It was either Tuesday or Wednesday I quit. Let's see. Tuesday.

Q. Would dates mean anything to you?

A. It would help, yes.

Q. Let's see. Sunday was May the——

A. (Interposing): May the 4th Sunday was.

Q. This is for the purpose of refreshing his memory. I have some time-sheets here on the West Cussetta. Would they help you in refreshing your memory? A. Yes, very much.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. What are those, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. Well, it's my overtime record from the time I was on the ship until I left it. It gives the overtime started until it ended and then the number of hours and the jobs that I was doing.

Q. You were in Gladstein's, or in that attorney's office there on Sunday. That would be May the 4th, wouldn't it? A. Yes.

Q. All right. And the Monday, the day following, would be May the 5th. Now, what happened on May the 6th, the next day, Tuesday?

A. I believe that's the day they offered me a ride to [6313] Seattle.

Q. Who offered you a ride to Seattle?

A. Craycraft and Mowery. They said they were going to Seattle and they would give me a ride up there.

Q. Did you ask them for a ride?

A. Oh, no.

Q. What did they say about that?

A. They says "Well, if you are going up to Seattle"—I told them I was pretty sure that I would get a relief because the ship was about due to sail and that I didn't want to go out on it. And they said, "Well, if you are going to Seattle we'll give you a ride up. We're going up that way."

Q. Did you take up their offer?

A. What?

Q. Did you take up their offer to give you a ride? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No, sir.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did you see Craycraft or Mowery or anyone else on Wednesday?

A. Oh, no. I was gone Wednesday.

Q. When did you leave the ship?

A. About eight o'clock in the morning.

Q. About eight o'clock in the morning?

A. Just previous to that the night mate, he gave me a call about six o'clock. They were going to start working [6314] cargo at seven and he gave me a call at six and he told me, he says—he says "You're in a pretty bad spot." And I says "What do you mean"?

"Well" he says "There has been a car outside the dock all night". He says "One of the Inspectors, Immigration Inspectors has come aboard and had checked to see if you was all right", and he says "They have been watching you for quite awhile now".

So I figured it was time to "take a powder". So I saw the first assistant and I told him that I was going to leave, and he told me—he says "Yes, you are in a pretty tough spot", he says.

I says 'Well, I will leave all my gear aboard". And he says "Yes, you can leave that aboard and we'll take care of it for you". So he says "Watch yourself".

And so I picked up a couple of fans and walked off the ship with a couple of fans and headed for this shore side electric shop that were doing a lot of work for us, the Marine Electric.

Q. What is the name of that shop?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. The Marine Electric.

Q. The Marine Electric Shop?

A. Yes, in Portland. And then I asked him to give me a lift to Vancouver and I wanted to catch a bus. So I caught a bus and went as far as Tacoma and then in Tacoma I took a cab [6315] and went down the highway and into Seattle, then I changed again and then I got my car and another fellow came down and picked up my clothes, and I had left the car—left him at Olympia and he came back as far as Olympia, and then I got my car and I beat *up in* the Olympic mountains,

Q. What did you do in the mountains?

A. Well, I did a little fishing.

Q. No drinking? A. No.

Q. Now, to go back to the day that you were in Gladstein's room there, in the hotel room on Saturday, that would be about May 2nd?

A. Saturday May the 3rd.

Q. May the 3rd?

A. Yes. I remember Saturday.

Q. May the 3rd, yes.

A. It is my birthday.

Q. Do you remember any other conversation that you may have had with Gladstein or Craycraft?

A. Yes. They were hammering about that——

Q. (Interposing) Concerning the FBI particularly. Was anything said about the FBI?

A. Oh, yes. They mentioned that the FBI was using Gestapo methods or words to that effect.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Now, who said that? [6316]

A. I believe it was Gladstein.

Q. Did he say that he knew all about Gestapo methods or anything like that, that he was familiar with them? A. No, I don't recall.

Q. Was anything mentioned about O'Neil?

A. I believe there was, yes, in regards to how he was getting—they made him testify and that he's arrested now and—how was that now? The best of my recollection was that he had mentioned O'Neil and how the FBI had used Gestapo methods on him; words to that effect.

Q. And did they say anything else about the FBI? Let me ask you this question, Mr. Cannalonga. Did either Gladstein or Craycraft suggest to you, if you remember, that you had been intimidated and threatened by the FBI?

A. Oh, yes, yes. I remember now what the argument was about. They kept hammering at me in regards that I must—that the FBI forced me to make statements that wasn't true. And I believe I told him that every statement I had made on the stand here previous was the best of my knowledge. And I think he harped about Schneidermann, too.

Q. Who did that? A. Gladstein.

Q. What did he say about Schneidermann?

A. Well, that I was all wet and wrong on that regards of Bridges being at the same meeting as Schneidermann in that [6317] private home.

Q. Do you remember anybody saying anything about the FBI having you "cold"?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Having me what?

Q. Cold? A. I didn't get that.

Q. Did you hear anybody saying anything about the FBI having you "cold"?

A. Oh, "cold". I believe that——

Q. (Interposing) At the time that you were making these statement to the FBI men?

A. Oh, I believe he did mention that "They must have had you cold".

Q. Do you remember who said that?

A. It was either Craycraft or Gladstein.

Q. To get back to the first time you met Craycraft, Mr. Cannalonga, did he mention anything about the FBI must have had a Mann Act charge against you? A. Yes, he mentioned that.

Q. And did he also say—give you the name of the girl that you were supposed to have transported from one state to another?

A. Yes, I believe he did. But I didn't take much notice of it because I thought it was damn funny at the time. Why, Jesus! somebody goofy on it! [6318]

Q. Did he even map out the route, the route that you were supposed to have taken?

A. Yes, I believe he did. It's like I say. I didn't give it much attention because it was so damn fantastic.

Q. Did you ever transport a girl from one state to another for any purpose? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. At any time? A. No.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did anyone ever question you about the circumstances under which you had made the statements to the FBI men prior to the time you appeared here to testify?

A. Well, it's like I said. What happened up in that hotel room, in a lawyer's office, is as vague as the devil. I might have been questioned, and if I did I might have made answers that I don't remember saying.

Q. Let me ask you this, Mr. Cannalonga. Did you at any time say to Craycraft or to any other person "Well, I was forced to testify falsely through intimidation of the FBI"?

A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Did you ever make that statement to Mr. Gladstein? [6319] A. No.

Q. At any time? A. No.

Q. Any place? A. No.

Q. Anywhere? A. No.

Q. Did you ever say this to Mr. Craycraft at any time, any place, anywhere: "So I proceeded to Portland that afternoon, went down to the ship" —no, excuse me. Strike that out, please.

Let me ask you this question. Mr. Craycraft appeared here in this proceedings to testify. I don't know the exact date. Among other things he said that he had a meeting with you on Friday night, May the 2nd, 1941. A. May the 2nd.

Q. And he stated as follows: —Craycraft said "So I proceeded to Portland that afternoon, went

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

down to the ship to see Mr. Cannalonga approximately eight at night and I explained to him that the attorneys had called and they wanted to talk to him on the testimony he gave in this trial and would he be willing to meet me. He said", meaning you, "He would be glad to. So I called Mr. Gladstein back at ten o'clock that night and then proceeded to Portland the next day, Saturday". . .

Will you state, please, if that is correct? [6320]

A. No, that's not correct. He asked me if—he had asked me—let's see—if I would see Gladstein, and I says "No, I don't want to see him".

"Well," he said "He wants to talk to you".

I said "The only thing I'll see him about is in regards to the Voice of the Federation calling me a stool pigeon and a labor spy".

Q. Now, Mr. Craycraft also testified that he again contacted you on Saturday, May 3, 1941 at ten o'clock and that he told you, advised you that Mr. Gladstein would be in on the 1:35 plane and that he, Craycraft, would meet you at around three o'clock. Did Mr. Craycraft so advise you?

A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't remember saying that. [6321]

Q. Will you state, if you haven't already stated, how you met Craycraft again on Saturday, May 3?

A. On Saturday, it is like I say—I had been drinking pretty heavy and——

Q. (Interposing) That is the time Craycraft contacted you and took you to the hotel?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Yes. I called up. I went out on the dock to phone to some grocery store.

Q. Now, Craycraft, while he was on the stand here, was asked this question by Mr. Gladstein:

"Mr. Craycraft, did Mr. Cannalonga say on that same afternoon in the Clyde Hotel, in the presence of yourself and myself and"—that is, Gladstein and Craycraft—"that he had told Mr. Medala and Mr. Dickstein that he would refuse to sign a statement to the effect that he had been at meetings with Schneidermann and Bridges because such a statement would be false?"

And Mr. Craycraft said, replied; "That is right?"

Did you have such a discussion as that with Gladstein or Craycraft?

A. No, I never. I never made no statement like that. In fact—I am quite sure of it.

Q. Were you under any kind of pressure at the time you made the statements to the FBI then?

A. No. At no time was I under any pressure.

[6322]

Q. Were you "gowed" up, Mr. *Craycraft?*

A. "Gowed" up—Jesus Christ, no. I never was "gowed" up—whatever you want to call it.

Q. Were you under the influence of any drug while you were making these statements?

A. No. I never was.

Q. Are you a drug fiend of any kind, Mr. Cannalonga? A. No.

Q. Had you taken any kind of a drug when

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

you were making these statements, or at any other time, for that matter, particularly——

A. (Interposing) I threw my hip out of joint up north. I saw a doctor, a marine doctor in Juneau, and the ship was leaving for Saskatchewan, and when we got down to Saskatchewan a prescription that the Doctor had made out for me I took it and—no, the Skipper went ashore and got it. On that prescription there was a dozen and a half of amytal sleeping tablets.

Q. Amytal? A. Yes.

Q. Not nembutal? A. No.

Q. Amytal? A. Yes.

Q. How do you spell it? [6323]

A. A-m-b-y-t-a-l.

Q. How many of those pills did you have?

A. Eighteen of them. I still got some left at home.

Q. You haven't used them all up? A. No.

Q. How many of those pills have you used?

A. Well, let me see—I think I have about eleven of them at home.

Q. How many of them did you take at any one time? A. One.

Q. And they were on orders of your doctor?

A. Yes.

Q. For what purpose were they given to you?

A. To make you sleep. It is a sleeping pill.

Q. Now, the statements I have in mind, that you made to the FBI men, are Government Ex-

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

hibits 208, 209 and 210. They were shown to you and you identified them at the last hearing.

Now, Mr. Cannalonga, were you intimidated in any way at the time you made those statements to the FBI men? A. No. If anything——

Q. (Interposing) What were your relations with the FBI men at the time you made these statements?

A. I thought they were a swell bunch of fellows.

Q. Who were the men, the FBI men?

A. John Madala there, the fellow with the brown suit on— [6324] if he will stand up.

Q. Did he, during any time that he was taking these statements from you, did he even as much as give you a dirty look? A. Oh, hell, no.

Q. Did Mr. Dickstein, the other agent?

A. No. He is just as good a guy as John there.

Q. What do you think of those two men, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. Well, I think they have very good personalities and they are pretty efficient.

Q. Would you be glad to shake their hands at any time you met them, anywhere?

A. Certainly I would.

Q. Now, did either Mr. Madala, here, or Mr. Dickstein, threaten you with any prosecution, with any kind of a prosecution? A. No.

Q. In particular, did they threaten you with a Mann Act porescution? A. No.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did they mention, tell you, or in your presence did they say anything about the Mann Act?

A. Not a thing.

Q. Did they at any time, and particularly during the time that they were taking these statements from you, state [6325] that, or talk between themselves, that the penalty for transporting a girl from one state into another was 20 years?

A. No.

Q. Or words to that effect?

A. No; never.

Q. When was the first time you heard the mention of the Mann Act and the fact that you had been transporting a girl from one state to another?

A. When Craycraft told me aboard ship.

Q. You hadn't heard that from any officer of the United States? A. No; never.

Q. Or about the 20 years, that you might be getting 20 years? A. No.

Q. Now, this same Craycraft was asked this question when he testified here:

"Thereafter, did Mr. Cannalonga say that, referring to the second time when he had been with the FBI agents, Madala and Dickstein, did he then say to you and to me that one of these FBI agents asked Cannalonga what had become of the girl Cannalonga picked up in Reno?"

And to that question, that was the question that Mr. Gladstein asked Craycraft, and then Craycraft answered:

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

"That is right." [6326]

Do you recall having any such discussion with Crayeraft and Gladstein? A. No.

Q. Did you say anything like that to either Mr. Gladstein or to Crayeraft? A. No.

Q. Did you say anything like that at any time in the presence of——

A. (Interposing) I would be crazy if I did.

Q. What?

A. I would be a nut if I did.

Q. Crayeraft was asked this other question by Mr. Gladstein—Mr. Gladstein asked him:

"Did Cannalonga then say in the Clyde Hotel that one of the FBI agents, referring to the second occasion of Mr. Cannalonga's meeting with Mr. Madala and Mr. Dickstein, proceeded to tell Mr. Cannalonga by name the various places in the various states where Mr. Cannalonga had stayed with a girl?"

And Crayeraft said:

"That is correct."

Did anything like that happen?

A. No. I never said anything like that.

Q. And then Mr. Gladstein asked Crayeraft this question:

"Did I"—meaning Gladstein—"at the Clyde Hotel ask Mr. Cannalonga whether the FBI agents on this second occasion [6327] had him cold?"

That is the expression I meant to use the other day.

To which Crayeraft replied:

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

"Yes."

Do you recall making any such statement to Mr. Gladstein?

A. No, I don't recall making any such statement.

Q. Now, Craycroft was also asked by Gladstein this question:

"Did Mr. Cannalonga say that he continued to tell the FBI agents that he knew nothing about Harry Bridges' membership in the Communist Party and that he had never attended any Communist Party meetings with him?"

And Craycraft said:

"That is right."

A. Read that again, please?

Q. This question was asked Craycraft, when he was on the stand, by Mr. Gladstein:

"Did Mr. Cannalonga say that he continued to tell the FBI agents"—that is during the time they were taking these statements, you know, these three statements from you—— A. Yes.

Q. (Continuing) ——"That he knew nothing about Harry Bridges' membership in the Communist Party and that he had never attended any Communist Party meetings with him?"

Meaning Bridges—and Craycraft said: [6328]

"That is right."

Did you say that in Mr. Gladstein's presence?

A. I never said anything, or words to that effect.

Q. Did you at any time tell Gladstein, or any-

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

one in Gladstein's presence, that you had never attended any Communist Party meetings with Bridges? A. Read that again, please?

Mr. Del Guercio: Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. No, not that I know about.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Craycraft testified here that when you met Madala, Mr. Madala and Mr. Dickstein the third time, you were presented with a typewritten statement and then Mr. Gladstein asked Craycraft his question here:

"Did Mr. Cannalonga say that he refused to sign the statement because it contained falsehoods?"

And Craycraft said:

"Yes."

A. No. I never said that.

Q. Did you make any such a statement to Mr. Craycraft? A. No.

Q. Or to Mr. Gladstein? A. No. [6329]

Q. Or to anybody in Mr. Gladstein's presence?

A. No.

Q Did you at any time refuse to sign a statement that the FBI agents had prepared because it contained falsehoods? A. No.

Q. As a matter of fact, Mr. Cannalonga, before you signed these three statements you made to the FBI you had read them over, had you not?

A. I read them and corrected them—that was

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

the first time on the stand. Those statements were the truth to the best of my knowledge.

Q. And were you given every opportunity to read those statements before you signed them by the FBI agents? A. Yes, I was.

Q. Now, Mr. Craycraft—I say Mr.—Craycraft testified in answer to a question asked by Gladstein, while on the stand, he said:

"Mr. Canalonga stated that he would be glad to come down to San Francisco and he would be willing to get up and tell the same story he told us"—meaning Craycraft and Gladstein—"that day, and the only request that he wanted was that he would be allowed to go to Seattle first to see some other parties whom he thought would be involved, and then proceed to Frisco to testify."

Presiding Inspector: Do you understand that?

[6330]

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you say that? A. No.

Q. Did you at any time tell Craycraft or Gladstein, or anyone in Gladstein's presence, that before you came down here to San Francisco to testify again you wanted to see somebody in Seattle?

A. No.

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment. Did they talk with you about coming down here?

The Witness: Your Honor, it is like I say, those two days are vague as hell.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Presiding Inspector: You can't remember?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: You can't remember whether they were talking about coming down here or not?

The Witness: Some points, you know, seem half clear and, like I say, I don't want to say for the simple reason that I have been hitting the booze heavy then.

Presiding Inspector: I understand your explanation. But do you recall whether there was talk about your coming down here again to testify?

The Witness: No, I don't.

Presiding Inspector: That is all. [6331]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Craycraft also testified to the effect that you were willing to make a deposition, or a statement, to Mr. Gladstein, and in that connection Mr. Craycraft said that you stated:

"I am willing to do that up to the part where it involves the FBI and the Mann Act charges."

Did you say anything like that?

A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. Did you say anything like that to Mr. Gladstein? A. No.

Q. Or Mr. Craycraft?

A. I don't believe I did.

Q. Or to anyone? A. No.

Q. Craycraft also testified that you said you would come down and testify to everything up to the point that involved the Mann Act charges and

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

the FBI, but that if you were going to testify on that you wanted to go to Seattle first to see some other people who you said were involved.

A. That sounds silly.

Q. Did you say anything like that to anybody?

A. I don't believe I did. Why would I want to say anything like that after I had been on the stand here and testifying, and then turn right around and make statements of [6332] that sort? So—well, I won't say the rest of it. I will just think it.

Q. Did your trip to Seattle, that you took to Seattle, have anything to do with your coming down here to testify, either for Mr. Gladstein, or anybody else? A. No.

Q. Now, at any time while you were on that ship, or at any time, say, after you left the stand here on, I believe it was April 17, were you, up to last Thursday, Mr. Cannalonga, were you contacted by any FBI agent? A. No.

Q. From the time you left the stand on April 17 to last Thursday? A. No.

Q. Were you contacted by, or did you speak to any Immigration Officer? A. No.

Q. Were you contacted by, or did you speak to any Government agent.

A. No. They couldn't contact me. I was up in the mountains.

Q. Did you at any time say to Mr. Gladstein, or to Mr. Craycraft, that you would be willing to give testimony in a deposition that the statements

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

you had made, that you had made to the FBI agents, were false? [6333] A. No.

Q. Now, do you recall—I believe you testified about leaving this attorney's office once—that is on a Sunday when you, Craycraft and Gladstein and some others were in there—that you left once to go to the toilet and——

Presiding Inspector: You have been all over that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am bringing it up——

A. (Interposing) Yes, like I told you at the start, I remember winding up in the toilet and throwing up.

Presiding Inspector: You have told us about that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, when you returned to the office did Gladstein say anything?

A. Yes. I walked back into that lawyer's office with Craycraft and he started to ask me about the Mann Act and I told him, "What are you trying to pull?" And I walked out on him.

Q. Did you use stronger language than that?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Now, Craycraft also testified like this:

"I mentioned prior to leaving that I was going to Seattle"—that is, he had reference then to Monday night, May 5, 1941—"so Cannalonga requested that I stop in and see Dr. Buckner while I was in Seattle, and he could tell me how he was all doped up in the hospital there." [6334]

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Did you ask Craycraft to see Dr. Buckner?

A. What day was that, on Monday?

Q. Monday night, May 5, 1941. Did you say anything like that to Craycraft at any time?

A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. He had mentioned about my hip and I said, "If you want to know about my hip you can go up and check with Dr. Buckner in Seattle. He has records of the time I spent in the hospital and what was wrong with me."

Q. Who was Dr. Buckner?

A. He is a bone specialist. He does all the orthopedic work up there for——

Q. (Interposing): Do you know what Dr. Buckner's reputation is? A. A-1.

Q. He is a specialist in his line?

A. Supposed to be one of the best bone doctors in the country.

Q. Did Dr. Buckner prescribe any kind of drug for you? A. No.

Q. Did he give you any pills, even sleeping pills?

A. No, I don't believe so. He just gave me his regular routine reatment.

Q. Do you know anybody by the name of Cole Jackman? [6335]

A. At times that name sounds familiar, but I wouldn't be able to pick him out, say, in this room here. I had seen him a few times here. I believe he

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

was on some part of the Strike Committee in Portland during the '36-'37 strike.

Q. Do you recall any such person coming down to the boat to see you?

A. Well, there is a possibility; yes. He might have come down, but I don't remember, you know, just by the name.

Q. Do you know Bert Nelson? A. Yes.

Q. Who is Burt Nelson?

A. He is a member of the longshoremen's union.

Q. Does he belong to the Communist Party?

A. He did; I don't know whether he does now or not.

Q. Did he come up to see you on that boat, on the West Cussetta? A. Yes.

Q. How many times?

A. Oh, a couple or three times; maybe more.

Q. What did he say to you?

A. The first time he invited me out to his home to have dinner.

Q. Did he say anything else to you?

A. He mentioned the Bridges case.

Q. What did he say about the Bridges case?

[6336]

A. Wanted to know why I testified against Bridges.

Q. Now, Mr. Cannalonga, to go back to this attorney's room there on Sunday, do you remember if you were asked whether or not the FBI had asked you if you had ever attended Communist meetings with Bridges, and do you remember if you

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

replied as follows to Mr. Gladstein's question and to Mr. Craycraft there:

"I told them, no; that I had been in meetings with him where there were Communists and non-Communists, and then I explained the Party structure, how it works with the rank and file, and the progressive groups in the union."

Do you recall making any such statement?

A. No— —

Q. (Interposing): I will read it again.

A. No, I don't recall making that statement.

[6337]

Q. In any discussions that you may have had with Gladstein and Craycraft with reference to your hip injury and your treatment by Doctor Buckner at Seattle did you make any statement to the effect that the Doctor in Juneau gave you a prescription and that you got a hundred of them?

A. No, I don't ever recall making any statement like that.

Q. Did you ever get a hundred sleeping pills at Juneau? A. No, never.

Q. Anywhere else? A. No.

Q. Did you ever have a hundred sleeping pills in your possession at any time?

A. No. I don't think they will sell you a hundred at a time.

Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Gladstein or Craycraft or anyone in the presence of Gladstein that you were under the influence of a drug which prevented

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

you from knowing what you were going or talking about at the time you made the statements to the FBI men?

A. No. I never recall making a statement of that sort.

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a recess?

Presiding Inspector. Yes. We will have a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

[6338]

Presiding Inspector: Call back the witness.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Mr. Cannalonga, did you ever tell Mr. Gladstein or Craycraft that you had stated to Mr. Madala and Dickstein, the FBI agents, that you had never to the best of your recollection been present at a meeting of Communists wherein Schneidermann and Bridges were also present?

A. No. I don't ever recall making any such statement.

Q. Did you ever make this statement to Mr. Gladstein or Mr. Craycraft or to anyone in Gladstein's presence, as follows: "You see, when I read these statements I was gowed up. If you don't know what 'gowed up' is, I was taking these pills pretty heavy. I was in pretty bad shape, and so instead of using them as sleeping pills, if you double the dose it makes everything rosy then."

Did you make any such statement?

A. No. I don't ever recall making any statement of that sort.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did you ever make any statement like this: "If you double the dose it makes everything rosy then" at any time? A. No.

Q. To anyone?

A. No, I don't recall making any such statement.

Q. Do you recall being asked this question on Sunday there in this lawyer's office in the presence of Gladstein and [6339] Craycraft and others: "So you signed the prepared statement that they had," meaning the FBI, "for you"? and did you answer "Yes"?

A. No. I don't ever recall making——

Q. (Interposing): And then were you asked this question: "And it contains statements that weren't true, is that right"? Do you recall being asked that question? A. No, I don't.

Q. And did you reply or do you recall replying "Correct"?

A. No, I don't recall.

Q. Now, Mr. Cannalonga, you said that you didn't see any agents of the Government from the time you left this stand here the last time you were here until last Thursday?

A. Right.

Q. Will you state under what circumstances you met an FBI man at that time, Thursday, last Thursday?

A. From last Thursday until today, you mean?

Q. Yes.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Well, I came back out of the mountains Thursday morning about two o'clock I got into Seattle, and I figured on getting in on about eight o'clock Wednesday night. Well, I burned out a bearing on the car and I had to make a quick repair out in the woods. So I got in about two o'clock in the morning and I slept a whole and then I went downtown and filed [6340] application into joining the Navy. And I didn't want to do a year in the Army on foot. I would rather do my four years on a ship than a year in the——(Pause). So I passed their physical test and then they gave me an examination and I passed the electrician's examination and they rated me First Class Electrician's Mate. And I got home in the afternoon quite late after being, you know, examined by the Navy and, well, I just got into the house and Mr. Madala drove by and stopped and knocked at the door and said that there was a subpoena out for me. And then Friday night we caught the train and come down here to San Francisco.

We arrived here—it was a slow train, I remember that. We slept two nights on the train, Friday and Saturday nights, and got here Sunday morning about eight o'clock. And I had been served with the subpoena, and since then I have been staying out at a hotel and manage to take a show in every night, going out to that Ice Follies and went swimming until today.

Q. Have you been drinking while you have been down here? A. No.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Mr. Del Guercio: You may cross examine.

Cross Examination

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you got the subpoena with you?

A. Yes. [6341]

Do I have to show him the subpoena?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, if he wants to see it.

Mr. Gladstein: Just a moment, your Honor.

(Whereupon the witness produced the subpoena.)

Presiding Inspector: Keep it until he asks for it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. May I see the subpoena?

A. (Handing subpoena to Mr. Gladstein).

Q. When was this served on you?

A. The date is on there.

Q. You tell me.

A. Well, let me see it then.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, let him see the subpoena. It is his there.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no. If you can remember it.

The Witness: Well, I don't remember it, your Honor. I want to look at it to see it.

Presiding Inspector: If you can remember you can answer.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. This week or last week?

A. I believe the second of this month—it is

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

dated the second. May the 6th it was dated out the top part of it and served June 2nd.

Q. Where were you when it was served on you?

A. Where I was? [6342]

Q. Where were you?

A. Well, it tells you where I was.

Q. I am asking you.

A. Oh, you are asking me. O. K. San Francisco.

Q. Were you served with any subpoena before June 2nd?

A. Well, you'll find out.

Presiding Inspector: No, you must answer. He has a right to ask you.

Mr. Myron: Of course, he was served the first time he appeared here.

Presiding Inspector: That isn't what he means. He means since he left the stand here.

Mr. Myron: This is the subpoena that has brought him here in Court, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't make any difference. If he wasn't served with a subpoena he can say so. If he was served with another subpoena he can say so.

Mr. Del Guercio: Tell him.

The Witness: Yes. I was served with another one in Seattle.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When?

A. When? On a Saturday.

Q. Do you have it with you?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. No, I haven't. [6343]

Q. Saturday of when?

A. Oh, the Saturday I got into Seattle. I got in on Thursday and I was served—no, I was served Friday. I beg your pardon.

Q. Which week?

Presiding Inspector: You mean, got back from Olympia?

The Witness: Yes, from the mountains. May I have your calendar, Judge?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: So I can get these dates straight.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly.

(The calendar referred to was passed to the witness.)

The Witness: Thank you. This is the 4th, isn't it, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: June the 4th. Oh, it was on or about May 30th.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Who served it on you?

A. A fellow from the Immigration Department.

Q. Do you have that subpoena in your pocket?

A. No, I haven't got it in my pocket.

Q. You don't have any other subpoena on you?

A. No, that is the only one.

Q. What did you do with that subpoena? [6344]

A. I think I have got it up in the hotel room.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Will you look in your pocket to see if you have the other subpoena?

A. I know I haven't.

Mr. Del Guercio: He said he doesn't have it.

The Witness: What do you want me to do? Search myself?

Mr. Myron: I don't think that is a proper question.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes. That is perfectly proper.

The Witness: No. It is up in the hotel room.

Presiding Inspector: If he says he hasn't it, that ends it, of course.

Mr. Myron: He says it was up in the hotel room, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I know. But he asked him if he would search his pocket. He can answer that. It is perfectly simple.

The Witness: I haven't got it on me, your Honor.

Do I get that back?

Presiding Inspector: No. I suppose they will introduce it in evidence. If they do you won't get it back. Otherwise you will.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you remember what the other subpoena said? A. I don't.

Q. When did it tell you to appear? [6345]

A. I don't remember.

Q. Was that other subpoena like this one, Mr. Cannalonga?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Yes, I believe it was. I didn't take a picture of it. It was just like the other subpoena. Aren't they all alike? I don't know.

Q. Did you read it?

A. No, I didn't read it.

Q. You didn't read the other subpoena?

A. I signed it, yes, and I believe I did glance at it. But I don't recall what it said.

Q. Who was the person who served it?

A. From the Immigration.

Q. Do you know who it was?

A. No, I don't remember his name.

Q. Where was it served?

A. In Seattle.

Q. Where in Seattle?

A. I believe up in the FBI office.

Q. When you say you "believe" you mean you don't know?

A. No. I told you. I believe it is up in the FBI office.

Q. Well, was it up in the FBI office?

A. Well, was it? Sure.

Q. All right. Now, where is that office? [6346]

A. It is up in the Federal Building, the new Court building. Yes. The new Court building.

Q. What time of the day was it served on you?

A. Well, you got me on that. I don't remember.

Q. Were you sober? A. Yes, I was sober.

Q. You don't remember the day, the time of the day?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. No, I don't. It was sometime in the—sometime during the day.

Q. Morning or afternoon?

A. I don't quite recall whether it was morning or afternoon.

Q. Who was with you when you were served?

A. Mr. Madala.

Q. Anybody else?

A. And that Immigration guy, and I think an office boy. Somebody was in the office. And then there was another fellow there. There was about four.

Q. Which Immigration guy?

A. I don't know his name.

Q. Did you ever see him before?

A. No.

Q. Is he the one who served it on you?

A. I did ask him to identify himself and he pulled out a badge that says "Immigration Department," and then he had a [6347] square gadget with his picture on it, because I wasn't going to take a subpoena from a perfect stranger. So I asked him to identify himself.

Q. Was it in Madala's office?

A. No, not Madala's office.

Q. Whose office?

A. Sort of a—you know, where they have a suite of offices and there is a place where your switchboard is and all that. Well, that part of the office.

Q. How long had you been up in that office before the subpoena was served?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Just got up there.

Q. Did you go up there alone or with somebody else.

Q. Who else? A. Two FBI men.

Q. Who were the two?

A. Mr. Madala and—I believe he can tell you the name of the other. I didn't take time off to ask him.

Q. Had you ever met that other one before?

A. No.

Q. What did you do with the subpoena when it was given to you?

A. Well, before I accepted it I had this fellow identify himself and he identified himself properly, then I took the subpoena and I glanced at it and saw that it was [6348] made out to me, and I put my John Henry on it and he had two copies, yes, and he signed one. The copy he gave me he signed, and I think he put the time on it, too, if I am not mistaken.

Q. What did you do with the subpoena when he gave it to you?

A. What else could I do?

Q. What did you do with it?

A. I stuck it in my pocket, of course.

Q. Did he tell you what the subpoena required you to do? A. No.

Q. Did anybody? A. No.

Q. Did you have any discussion about the subpoena? A. No.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did anybody suggest that you were supposed to come to San Francisco and testify under that subpoena?

A. Well, it was written on it.

Q. It was? You saw that? A. Yes.

Q. When did it say that you were supposed to be here? A. I don't recall.

Q. Did you have any discussion with anybody as to when you were supposed to be here?

A. No. Could I have that thing back? You are liable to forget it. That is my property. [6349]

Q. Oh, yes, you will get it back. A. O. K.

Q. Did you read it through to find out what it required you to do?

A. Would you repeat it again? "Did you read it through to find out"—was it? It just says "appear at San Francisco," to the best of my knowledge, and I don't recall the date or how I was to get down here or anything else on it. I don't think it specifies.

Q. You say you don't think it specifies the date when you were supposed to testify?

A. No, on how to get down here. It must have had a date on it, yes.

Q. Did you ask anybody as to when you were supposed to come down here to testify?

Mr. Del Guercio: It has been asked and answered, your Honor. He is making much to do—what if there were two subpoenas? We will admit that there were two subpoenas issued. One was served on him up there and one down here.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Presiding Inspector: He may answer.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you want the question read?

A. Yes, read the question, please.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. No, I don't believe I did. [6350]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You paid no further attention to the subpoena? A. No.

Q. And nobody discussed it with you?

A. Oh, I don't recall.

Q. Did anybody tell you that you didn't have to bother about that subpoena?

A. No. What's all this anyway over a subpoena? Will you tell me, your Honor. Give me a fair idea.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't make any difference. All you have to do is to answer the questions. If you can't answer them by lack of knowledge, you say so.

The Witness: Because, you know——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) There is no use of arguing here.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. After the subpoena was served on you did you stay up in that office?

A. No. Let's see. No I caught the eleven o'clock train that night for San Francisco here.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Did you leave——

A. (Interposing): I figured that——

Q. (Continuing): Did you leave Seattle on the same day that the subpoena was served on you?

A. Yes. [6351]

Q. With whom did you come?

A. With the FBI man, Madala.

Q. Was anybody else on that trip?

A. I believe another agent came on at Portland; a fellow by the name of Means, I think it is.

Q. Did he then travel with the two of you?

A. Huh?.

Q. Did Mr. Means then travel with you and Madala? A. Yes, we rode down together.

Q. Anybody else?

A. No, that's all.

Q. What did you do when you got to San Francisco?

A. Went up and registered at a hotel.

Q. When was that? A. Sunday morning.

Q. Did you go up there alone or with anybody else?

A. Well, I had another fellow with me.

Q. Who? A. Madala.

Q. Did he register there too?

A. I think he did. I don't know.

Q. Don't you know whether he registered and had a room there?

A. Well, I'm not going to follow the guy. I don't know. [6352]

Q. That was on Sunday morning?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Yes, Sunday morning.

Q. This last Sunday?

A. Yes, this last Sunday.

Q. After you registered did you see Mr. Madala again that day? A. Yes.

Q. Where?

A. I think he and I went to a show together.

Q. When did you meet him? A. Huh?

Q. When did you meet him?

A. In the afternoon. Yes, it was around supper time; after supper.

Q. Where did you meet him?

A. At the hotel.

Q. Did he come to the hotel?

A. I think I run into him in the lobby. I'm not sure.

Q. Did you see anybody from the FBI or the Immigration Office from the time that you arrived Sunday morning until the time that you met Mr. Madala in the lobby of the hotel?

Presiding Inspector: Answer it.

A. Repeat that again. I didn't quite get you. Why don't you shorten out the questions?

By Mr. Gladstein: [6353]

Q. What's that?

A. Shorten your questions out instead of making them so long.

Presiding Inspector: Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

The Witness: I could have seen 50 of them and not know it.

Presiding Inspector: Well, he means did you see them to speak with?

The Witness: Yes, I believe I did. Some friend of Mr. Madala, I was introduced to him and——

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. (Interposing): Did you see Mr. Del Guercio that day? A. No.

Q. Did you see Mr. Myron?

A. Who's Myron?

Mr. Myron: I am.

The Witness: No, I didn't see him that day either.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you see any of the other people who are here at the Government Counsel table?

A. Let's see. Sunday. Yes, I believe I saw one other.

Q. Which one? [6354]

A. I think Mr. Donnelley. I am not sure. I wouldn't swear to it or be positive about it.

Q. Point him out, please.

A. That guy with the glasses there (Indicating)

Q. You mean Mr. Connelley?

A. Connelley.

Q. The man at the end of the table here in the brown suit?

A. Uh-huh (Affirmative)

Q. Where did you see him?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. I don't recall where I saw him.

Q. At the FBI office?

A. I don't recall.

Q. How much time did you spend with Mr. Connelley on that Sunday?

A. I don't think I spent much time with him.

Q. Did you talk with him at all?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Did you talk with Mr. Madala at all about the case?

A. Well, we couldn't have done much talking. We went to a show.

Q. Did you or not?

A. Well, that's the answer.

Q. At any time on that Sunday.

A. Well, what do you want me to say? I don't get that [6355] one either.

Presiding Inspector: He wants you to say whether you talked with him concerning anything about this case on that Sunday. You can answer that "Yes" or "No," I should think.

The Witness: Well,——(Pause)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. "Yes" or "No," please.

Mr. Del Guercio: Do you understand the question?

The Witness: I still don't quite understand it.

Presiding Inspector: Did you talk over any of this case with Mr. Madala on that Sunday?

The Witness: Yes, I believe I did.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Where? A. Huh?

Q. Where were you when you talked about it?

A. Oh, on the way to the show.

Q. Did you talk about your testimony in this case?

A. No, I don't believe so.

Q. Did you talk about Craycraft's testimony?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Did you talk about Mr. Shoemaker's testimony? A. I don't think so.

Q. Did you talk to anybody on that Sunday regarding your testimony in this case or Craycraft's testimony or Mr. [6356] Shoemaker's testimony?

A. I believe I did discuss—but I don't recall what I said, because naturally a person will talk about something that he is interested in.

Q. Well, whom did you talk with on Sunday regarding anybody's testimony in this case?

Mr. Myron: I think he just answered the question. If he asks him when did he talk about the case with somebody I suppose he can tell him.

Presiding Inspector: This witness has said that he talked about the case with Mr. Madala.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Is that correct?

A. I believe it is, yes.

Q. Can you remember anything that was said by you or Mr. Madala on that Sunday when you discussed the case? A. No, I don't.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. Nothing about your testimony?

A. No.

Q. Nothing about Craycraft's testimony.

A. Just casual talking over the thing.

Q. Nothing about Craycraft's testimony, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. No, I don't believe so.

Q. Nothing about Mr. Shoemaker's testimony?

A. Who is Shoemaker?

Q. Well, did you discuss the testimony of a Mr. [6357] Shoemaker in this case? A. No.

Q. In your discussion or talks with Mr. Connelley on that Sunday did you discuss any of the testimony in this case?

A. Yes, I believe I did.

Q. Whose testimony? A. Huh?

Q. Whose testimony?

A. About myself, naturally.

Q. What was that discussion? A. Huh?

Q. What was the discussion?

A. Well, don't yell at me that way either. I don't like your tone of voice.

Presiding Inspector: Never mind. Answer the question.

The Witness: Your Honor,——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, well, answer the question.

A. (Continuing): Well, ask that question again, please.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. *Where you* when this discussion was held, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. Oh, I don't just quite recall where I was.

[6358]

Q. Was it in your hotel room?

A. I can't recall whether it was in the hotel room, or up in the office or——

Q. (Interposing) What time of day was it?

Mr. Myron: Which discussion is this you are referring to?

Mr. Gladstein: I think it is clear from my question the reference is to the discussion with Mr. Connelley.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you have that in mind, Mr. Cannalonga?

A. What is that again?

Q. What time of the day was it on Sunday, this last Sunday, when you talked with Mr. oCnnelley about your testimony in this case?

Mr. Del Guercio: Why don't you ask him if he made any statement to Mr. Connelley?

Presiding Inspector: He can put the question as he sees fit. Go ahead.

Mr. Gladstein: Will you read the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. That is the first of June, wasn't it?

I didn't get the question. Read it again.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

(The question referred to was reread by the reporter as above recorded.) [6359]

A. What time? Well, that I don't recall either.

Presiding Inspector: Was it in the morning or in the afternoon?

The Witness: I think it was in the afternoon some time.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. How long a period of time did you talk to Mr. Connelley about your testimony in this case?

A. Well, I couldn't say that either; I don't remember.

Q. Was it half an hour?

A. No. I don't remember how long it was.

Q. Was it more or less than a half hour, do you think? A. Well——

Presiding Inspector: He is asking you for your best recollection about this. Probably you didn't look at a watch. Give him your best recollection.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was it as much as a hour?

A. No—I don't know.

Q. Do you think it was a little less than an hour?

A. It could have been less or it could have been more.

Q. Was anybody else present besides you and Mr. Connelley when you talked with him?

A. Yes. There was, I think there was, two fellows there.

Q. Which two fellows? [6360]

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. On Sunday—your Honor, I am trying to figure whether it was a Sunday.

Presiding Inspector: This was the last Sunday, three days ago.

A. (Continuing): I remember making a statement to the FBI. I don't know whether it was on Sunday or Monday. I got the days confused. I think I can clarify that easy enough by asking Mr. Connelley if he remembers what day it was.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You say you made a statement to Mr. Connelley? A. Yes.

Q. You mean a written statement?

A. A written statement.

Q. Is that the first time that you discussed with any representative of the FBI during the last month, let us say, your testimony in this case?

A. Repeat that again.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Do you understand the question?

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will make it clear to you, Mr. Cannalonga. You say that you made a statement to Mr. Connelley, a written statement, and you are not sure whether it was Sunday, this [6361] last Sunday, or the following day, Monday, is that right?

A. Right.

Q. At the time you made that written statement

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

to Mr. Connelley, whether it was Sunday or Monday, was that the first time that you discussed your testimony, or Craycraft's testimony, or the testimony of a Mr. Shoemaker, at any time during the last month? A. I believe it is.

Q. Is there any doubt in your mind about it?

A. Well, it is like I say—I am kind of doubtful on those two days, but outside of that, I haven't talked to nobody, to no FBI men in regard to the case.

Q. So you didn't talk to Mr. Madala, or any of the other FBI men, on your trip to San Francisco this last time? A. No.

Q. Or to any Immigration Inspector or representative of the Immigration office? — A. No.

Q. And on the day that you spoke to Mr. Connelley that is the only time, up to the time that you took the stand here today, that you have discussed your testimony, or Craycraft's testimony, or anybody's testimony in the Bridges case?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, where were you when you made that statement?

A. When I made that statement where was I? [6362]

Q. Yes. A. Up in the offices of the FBI.

Q. Do you recall when it was?

A. No. If you ask him he will tell you what day it was.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't quite get the question—when it was?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

The Witness: When it was, yes.

Presiding Inspector: You already asked when it was.

The Witness: Is it all right if I ask Mr. Connelley?

Presiding Inspector: No. He is testing your recollection.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You said a couple of others were there too and Mr. Connelley? A. Yes.

Q. Do you see any of them here?

A. Yes, Mr. Weeks, and that is all I do see, and Mr. Main was there.

Mr. Gladstein: Mr. Weeks. will you stand?

(Whereupon Mr. Weeks stood.)

Mr. Del Guercio: You don't have to stand.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you see Mr. Weeks standing?

A. That is the guy with the blue tie, white shirt and curly hair. (Indicating). [6363]

Mr. Gladstein: There is no question—Mr. Del Guercio, I want to ask you this through the Court—that Mr. Weeks has been identified by the witness?

Mr. Del Guercio: There is no question at all—Mr. Weeks was there.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. How long were you with Mr. Connelley on that occasion?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. Oh, from about three o'clock until, I believe four o'clock. Then they changed stenographers and from four o'clock to five o'clock, and I believe they had another change of stenographers, and it wound up about, I would say, about seven o'clock, six-thirty or seven o'clock. I had got up a couple of times and went out and come back again.

Did you hear me then?

The Reporter: Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Since you gave that statement you have talked to nobody about any of the testimony in this case, is that right?

A. Since I gave that statement I talked to nobody, you say?

Q. Is that correct?

A. Well, you know that covers a large field. I read newspapers and——

Presiding Inspector: He means about the testimony in [5364] the case.

A. (Continuing): About the testimony—no, I haven't.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you sign that statement? A. Yes.

Q. When did you sign it?

A. The same day they finished it.

Q. When did they finish it?

A. I just got through telling you. I don't remember what day it was.

Q. What time of the day?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

A. It was, oh—I signed it the next day.

Q. Where did you sign it?

A. I went up in their office and read it over and then signed each page there. It was the following day; yes.

Q. What time the following day?

A. Oh, about ten o'clock.

Q. Was that yesterday? A. Yeah.

Q. What is the answer?

A. Yeah. No, I think I signed it—yes, Monday I signed it, I think. I am not sure now whether it was Monday or Tuesday. I know it was the day following after I made the statement and, if I am not mistaken, I made that statement on a Sunday.

[6365]

Q. The day you came here? A. Yeah.

Q. And do you know now where you saw Mr. Connelley on Sunday, the day you came here?

A. Well, I told you where I saw him the first time. Naturally, when I came in the first day I saw him; yes.

Q. Do you know where it was?

A. I think it was up in their office.

Q. Who took you up there?

A. I got off the train, and went up to the hotel and took a shower. I don't recall his name.

Q. Have you talked with Mr. Del Guercio before you went on the stand? A. No.

Q. Have you talked with Mr. Myron before you went on the stand?

A. No. You mean about the case here?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. I mean about the case, or your testimony, or anybody's testimony in the case?

A. No, I haven't.

Q. Have you talked to them at all about anything?

A. No. I did see them eating their lunch one day.

Q. What is that?

A. I did see them in a restaurant about five tables away across the dining room if that is what you mean. [6366]

Q. In the same hotel where you stayed?

A. Oh, no.

Q. Where did you stay?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I don't believe, under the circumstances, the witness——

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.

Mr. Myron: It is pretty dangerous.

Mr. Grossman: He can move away.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.

The Witness: I won't answer it.

Mr. Myron: I think the witness should be given some protection here.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see that he needs any protection.

Mr. Myron: Well, it is pretty evident that he does. I think his place of abode has no materiality to this case at all.

Presiding Inspector: I am not so sure about that. We will take his answer if the witness will answer it.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

The Witness: And if I don't answer, your Honor?

Mr. Del Guercio: Go on and answer. We will give you sufficient protection.

A. At the Sutter Hotel—S-u-t-t-e-r.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Have you been staying there since you arrived [6367] Sunday? A. Yes.

Q. Did you register under your own name?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Now, besides those that you have named, I want you to look around the Government table, and also the side wall there, and the court room—and take plenty of time—and pick out every person that you see here who is connected in any way with the FBI, or the Immigration Service, or the Government, to your knowledge, with whom you have talked since you arrived here on Sunday.

Do you understand the question?

A. In other words, you want me to pick out everybody that is——

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: You went into the same matter as to about what happened in Portland, or wherever it was Mr. Gladstein went and interviewed this witness. I think we can have the same examination on the other side.

You look around, if you are willing, and indicate who you have seen that you have talked with.

A. (Glancing around room): Well, there has

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

been two FBI men with me practically at all times when I was on the streets because they thought I needed some protection.

There is one of them in the back of the hall there standing up with the—— [6368]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What is his name?

A. Some Irish name.

Q. How much of the time has he been with you since you arrived here?

A. Oh, I believe I went to a show—I went swimming with him yesterday, and to a show. We went out to the Cliff House and had a little lunch, and after we had swam a while, and then we went and saw "Blood and Sand," the Tyrone Power picture.

Q. What is his name, the FBI agent?

A. Why don't you ask him yourself?

Q. Don't you know it?

A. I suppose I do, part of it.

Q. What is it, if you know?

A. I don't recall his last name.

Q. What do you call him? A. Joe.

Q. What? A. Joe—J-o-e—Joe.

Q. Who else?

A. Then Mr. Madala (indicating) and I don't see anybody else. There was Mr. Devereau.

Q. What is that?

A. There was a Mr. Devereau and Mr. Means—four of [6369] them.

Q. Can you think of any others?

A. No, that's all.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Q. What about Mr. Cassidy? A. Huh?

Q. What about Mr. Cassidy?

A. Cassidy?

Q. Have you seen him?

A. No, I haven't seen no Cassidy. What's he look like?

Mr. Gladstein: Mr. Cassidy, would you be good enough to stand up?

(Whereupon Mr. Cassidy arose in response to Mr. Gladstein's request.)

The Witness: No. I have never been with him.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You have never been with him?

A. No. There were just four of them. They relieved each other.

Q. Well, at least two of them have been with you pretty much of the time since you got to San Francisco? A. Yes.

Q. Would you say all the time?

A. No, I wouldn't say all the time.

Q. What times were they not with you? [6370]

A. Well, when I went to bed.

Q. That's the only time? That's the only time, Mr. Cannalonga? A. Huh?

Q. That's the only time?

A. Yes, that's all.

Mr. Gladstein: May we offer this for identification, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly. Have it marked for identification.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

(The document referred to was marked for identification as Alien's Exhibit No. 48.)

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, it is after four. If you don't mind adjourning for the day, we have a request to make for something for you to do between now and tomorrow morning.

We would like to have Mr. Wixon produce for you—and I am sure he will at your request—a record of, which would include a copy of, any subpoenas served on Mr. Cannalonga.

Now, it may be that some of them were signed by Mr. Wixon or signed by the Seattle office. Of course, he could check that very easily and I am sure there would be a record showing the man who served it and when it was served and where it was served. [6371]

Presiding Inspector: Didn't he say something in all our presence about subpoenas being issued from the north somewhere?

Mr. Grossman: It is possible.

Presiding Inspector: I think he did.

Mr. Grossman: It is possible we would have to do it by telegram, and I request that you suggest that so we can have it as soon as possible.

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: Mr. Wixon does not have them I have those.

Presiding Inspector: You have them?

Mr. Gladstein: Do you have them now?

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Del Guercio says he has them.

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Mr. Grossman: The only question is this. I think we should have those that Mr. Del Guercio has, but Mr. Del Guercio can't state positively probably whether any others have been served. That's why we would like Mr. Wixon's statement as to whether any others have been. This may be all. There may be others.

Presiding Inspector: I think Mr. Del Guercio, in the first instance—we had just better follow Mr. Del Guercio's offer and statement that he has them. If that doesn't——

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) If he states that he has them all, that satisfies me. [6372]

Presiding Inspector: You don't have to answer this.

Mr. Del Guercio: If I don't, I should have. I'll look.

Presiding Inspector: As far as you know from the office here you have?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: That is as I understood.

Mr. Gladstein: Would you mark them for identification?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. I don't have the subpoena that was served on him up there. It is back there in the office, but I will have it available.

Presiding Inspector: You will hand them in tomorrow morning in so far as they are here.

Mr. Gladstein: Do you have others now which relate to Mr. Cannalonga?

(Testimony of Maurice J. Cannalonga.)

Mr. Del Guercio: The original—what is that that you have? A copy there?

The Witness: This one here is dated May 6th and signed by Samuel—something or other.

Presiding Inspector: I think you have them all. We will recess until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 o'clock p.m. an adjournment was taken to Thursday, June 5, 1941, at 10:00 o'clock a.m.) [6373]